A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the Object of

Religious Worship.

OR, A

SCRIPTURE PROOF

OF THE

UNLAWFULNESS of giving any Religious Worship to any other Being Besides the One

Supreme God.

Dr Sherlock

PART I.

William Sherlock

LONDON:

Printed for *Abel Swalle*, at the *Unicorn*, at the West-end of St. *Pauls* Church-yard.

MDCLXXXV.

A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the Object of

Religious Worship.

OR, A

SCRIPTURE PROOF

OF THE

UNLAWFULNESS of giving any

Religious Worship to any other Being

Besides the One

Supreme God.

PART I.

LONDON:

Printed for *Abel Smalle*, at the *Theatre*, at the West-end of St. *Paul's* Church-yard.

MDCLXXXV.

A DISCOURSE

Concerning the Object of Religious Worship.

The INTRODUCTION.

OF all the Disputes between us and the Church of Rome, *there is none of greater concernment, than that about the Object of Religious Worship.*

We affirm, as the Scripture has taught us, that we must worship the Lord our God and serve him only; *the Church of* Rome *teaches, that there is a degree of Religious Worship, which we may give to some excellent Creatures, to Angels and Saints and Images, and the Host, and to the Reliques of Saints and Martyrs. If they are in the right, we may be thought very rude and uncivil at least, in denying to pay that Worship, which is due to such excellent Creatures, and very injurious to our selves in it, by losing the benefit of their Prayers and Patronage. If we be in the right, the Church of* Rome *is guilty of giving that worship to Creatures which is due to God alone, which is acknowledged on all hands to be the greatest of sins; and therefore this is a dispute which can never be compremised, though we were never so desirous of an union and reconciliation with the Church of* Rome; *for the Incommunicable glory of God, and the salvation of our Souls, are too dear things to be given away in complement to any Church.* 4. Mat. 10.

And should it appear in the next world (for I believe it will never appear to be so in this) that we were mistaken, that we were over-nice and curious in refusing to worship Saints and Angels, yet ours is a much more innocent and pardonable mistake, than that which the Church of Rome *is guilty of, if*

they should prove to be mistaken. We are only wanting in some Religious Courtship, which we might innocently have given to Saints and Angels, but which we were not bound to give, (as the Church of Rome *will not say, that we are) by any express Divine Law; and therefore it is no sin against God not to do it; and when this neglect is not owing to any designed contempt and dis-regard of those excellent Spirits, but to a great reverence for God, and jealousie for his incommunicable glory, if it were a fault, we need not doubt but that God would pardon it, and that all good spirits, who have such a profound veneration for God, will easily excuse the neglect of some Ceremonies to themselves upon so great a reason.*

But if the Church of Rome *be mistaken, and gives that worship to Creatures, which is due only to the Supreme God, they have nothing to pretend in excuse of it; neither any positive Law of God, which expresly forbids all Creature-worship (as I doubt not to prove, to the satisfaction of all impartial Readers) nor the principles of Natural Reason; which, whatever Apologies it may make for the worship of Saints and Angels, can never prove the necessity of it; and it highly concerns the Church of* Rome, *and all of her Communion to consider, whether if their distinctions and little appearances of reason cannot justifie their worship of Creatures, they will be able to excuse them from the guilt of so great a sin.*

But not to insist on these things now; I shall divide this discourse into three parts.

1. *I shall prove from the plain evidence of Scripture,* That God alone is to be worshipped.

2. *I shall examine what that worship is, which is proper and peculiar to the Supreme God.*

3. *I shall consider those distinctions, whereby the Church of* Rome *justifies her worship of Saints and Angels, and Images, &c.*

SECT.

SECTION I.

That GOD alone must be Worshipped.

TO make good the first point, that we must worship no other Being, but only God, I shall principally confine my self to Scripture evidence, which is the most certain authority to determine this matter. For though I confess, it seems to me a self evident and fundamental principle in natural Religion, that we must worship none but that Supreme Being, who made, and who governs the world, yet I find men reason very differently about these matters. Sect. 1.

The Heathen Philosophers, who generally acknowledged one Supreme and Soveraign Deity, did not think it incongruous, nor any affront or diminution to the Supreme God, to ascribe an inferiour kind of Divinity, nor to pay an inferiour degree of Religious Worship to those excellent Spirits, which are so much above us, and have so great a share in the government of this lower world, no more than it is an affront to a Soveraign Monarch, to honour and reverence his great Ministers of State, or peculiar Favourites. And the Church of *Rome*, as she has corrupted Christianity with the Worship of Angels, and Saints departed, so she defends her self with the same Arguments and Reasons, which were long since alleadged by *Celsus* and *Porphyrie*, and other Heathen Philosophers, in defence of their Pagan Idolatry.

And it must be confest, that these Arguments are very popular, and have something so agreeable in them, to the natural notions of Civil Honour and respect, which

admits of great variety of degrees, that I do not wonder that such vast numbers of men, both wise and unwise, have been imposed on by them.

For there is certainly a proportionable reverence and respect due even to created excellencies, and every degree of power challenges and commands a just regard, and we are bound to be very thankful not only to God, who is the first cause, and the supreme giver of all good things, but to our immediate Benefactors also. And therefore if there be a sort of middle Beings, as the Heathens believed, and as the Church of *Rome* asserts, between us and the Supreme God, who take particular care of us, and either by their power and interest in the government of the world, or by their Intercessions with the Supreme God, can and do bestow a great many Blessings on us, it seems as natural and necessary to fear and reverence, to honour and worship them, and to give them thanks for their care and patronage of us, as it is to court a powerful Favourite, who by his interest and authority can obtain any request we make to our Prince; and the first seems to be no greater injury to God, than the second is to a Prince. Thus St. *Paul* observes, that there
2 Col. 18. is a shew of humility in worshipping Angels, that men dare not immediately approach so glorious a Majesty as God is, but make their addresses by those excellent spirits which attend the Throne of God, and are the Ministers of his Providence.

But then every one who believes that there is one Supreme God, who made all other Beings, though never so perfect and excellent, must acknowledge, that as there is nothing common to God and Creatures, so there must be a peculiar Worship due to God, which no Creatures can challenge, nay share in. It is no affront to a Prince to pay some inferiour degrees of civil honour and respect to his Ministers and Favourites, because as the difference

between

between a Prince and his Subjects is not founded in nature, but in civil order; so there are different degrees of civil respect proportioned to the different ranks and degrees of men in the Common-wealth. There is a degree of preheminency which is sacred and peculiar to the Person of the Prince, and no Prince will suffer his greatest Favourite to usurp the Prerogative honours which belong to the Crown; but while they are contented with such respects as are due to their rank and station, this is no injury to the Prince; for all civil honour is not peculiar to the Prince, but only a supereminent degree of it, and therefore inferiour degrees of honour may be given to other persons.

But though there are different degrees of civil honour proper to different ranks and degrees of men, who all partake in the same nature, and are distinguisht only by their different places in the Common-wealth; yet in this sense there are no different degrees of Religious Worship. All Religious Worship is peculiar to the Divine Nature, which is but one, and common only to three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God blessed for ever, Amen. Civil honour and Religious Worship differ in the whole kind and species of actions, and have as different objects as God and Creatures; and we may as well argue from those different degrees of civil honour among men, to prove that there is an inferiour degree of civil honour due to Beasts, as that there is an inferiour degree of Religious Worship due to some men. For all degrees of Religious Worship are as peculiar and appropriate to God, as civil respects are to men, and as the highest degree of civil honour is to a Soveraign Prince.

However should we grant, that some excellent Creatures might be capable of some inferiour degrees of Religious Worship; yet as the Prince is the fountain of ci-

vil honour, which no Subject muſt preſume to uſurp, without a grant from his Prince, ſo no Creature, how excellent ſoever, has any natural and inherent right to any degree of Religious Worſhip, and therefore we muſt not preſume to worſhip any Creature without Gods command, nor to pay any other degree of Worſhip to them, but what God has preſcribed and inſtituted; and the only way to know this, is to examine the Scriptures, which is the only external revelation we have of the will of God.

Let us then inquire, what the ſenſe of Scripture is in this controverſie; and I ſhall diſtinctly examine the teſtimonies both of the Old and New Teſtament, concerning the object of Religious Worſhip.

SECT. II.

The Teſtimonies of the Moſaical Law conſidered.

Sect. 2. 1. TO begin with the Old Teſtament; and nothing is more plain in all the Scripture, than that the Laws of *Moſes* confine Religious Worſhip to that one Supreme God, the Lord *Jehovah*, who Created the Heavens and the Earth. For,

1. The *Iſraelites* were expreſly commanded to Worſhip the Lord *Jehovah*, and to Worſhip no other Being; as our Saviour himſelf aſſures us, who I ſuppoſe will be allowed for a very good Expoſitor of the Laws of *Moſes*. *It is written, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* In the *Hebrew* Text, from whence our Saviour cites this Law, it is only ſaid, *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, and ſerve him*, without that addition, *of him only*. And yet both the Septuagint and the vul-

4 Matth. 10.
6 Deutr. 13.
10 Deutr. 20.

gar

gar Latine, read the words as our Saviour doth, *him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; and the authority of our Saviour is ſufficient to juſtifie this Interpretation; and withal, gives us a general rule, which puts an end to this controverſie; that as often as we are commanded in Scripture to worſhip God, we are commanded alſo to worſhip none beſides him.

For indeed the firſt Commandment is very expreſs in this matter, and all other Laws which concern the object of Worſhip, muſt in all reaſon be expounded by that. *Thou ſhalt have none other Gods before me.* The Septuagint renders it πλὴν ἐμοῦ beſides me; ſo does the *Chaldee*, *Syriack*, and *Arabick* to the ſame ſenſe. And it is univerſally concluded by all Expoſitors that I have ſeen, that the true interpretation of this Commandment is, that we muſt Worſhip no other God, but the Lord *Jehovah*. To pay Religious Worſhip to any Being, does in the Scripture notion, make that Being our God, which is the only reaſon, why they are commanded not *to have any other Gods*. For there is but one true God, and therefore in a ſtrict ſenſe, they can have no other Gods, becauſe there are no other Gods to be had; but whatever Beings they worſhip, they make that their God by worſhipping it; and ſo the Heathens had a great many Gods, but the *Jews* are commanded to have but one God, that is, to worſhip none elſe beſides him. 20 Exod. 3.

In other places God expreſly forbids them to worſhip any *ſtrange Gods*, *or the Gods of the people*, *or thoſe Nations that were round about them.* And leaſt we ſhould ſuſpect, that they were forbid to worſhip the Gods of the people, only becauſe thoſe Heathen Idolaters worſhipped Devils and wicked Spirits, the Prophet *Jeremiah* gives us a general notion, who are to be reputed falſe Gods, and not to be worſhipped. *Thus ſhall ye ſay unto them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the* 6 Deutr. 14. 70 Jere. 11.

Earth,

Earth, even they ſhall periſh from the Earth, and from under theſe Heavens. So that whatever Being is worſhipped, whether it be a good or a bad Spirit, which did not make the Heavens and the Earth, is a falſe God to ſuch Worſhippers: and I ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* will not ſay, that Saints or Angels, or the Virgin *Mary* (as much as they magnifie her) made the Heavens and the Earth. And then according to this rule they ought not to be worſhipt.

But to put this paſt doubt, that the true meaning of theſe Laws is to forbid the worſhip of any other Being beſides the Supreme God, I ſhall obſerve two or three things in our Saviours anſwer to the Devils temptation, which will give great light and ſtrength to it.

1. That our Saviour abſolutely rejects the worſhip of any other Being together with the Supreme God. The thing our Saviour condemns, is not the renouncing the worſhip of God for the worſhip of Creatures, (for the Devil never tempted him to this) but the worſhip of any other Being beſides God, though we ſtill continue to worſhip the Supreme God. *It is written, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Which is a plain demonſtration, that men may believe & worſhip the Supreme God, and yet be Idolaters, if they worſhip any thing elſe beſides him. The Devil did not deſire our Saviour to renounce the worſhip of the Supreme God, but was contented, that he ſhould worſhip God ſtill, ſo he would but worſhip him alſo. And therefore it is no reaſon to excuſe the Church of *Rome* from Idolatry, becauſe they worſhip the Supreme God, as well as Saints and Angels; this they may do, and be Idolaters ſtill; for Idolatry does not conſiſt meerly in renouncing the worſhip of the Supreme God, but in worſhipping any thing elſe, though we continue to worſhip him. When the *Jews* worſhipt their *Baalims* and falſe gods,

gods, they did not wholly renounce the worſhip of the God of *Iſrael*; and the Heathens themſelves, eſpecially the wiſeſt men amongſt them, did acknowledge one Supreme God, though they worſhipt a great many inferiour Deities with him.

2. Our Saviour in his anſwer to the Devils temptation, does not urge his being a wicked and Apoſtate Spirit, an enemy and a rebel againſt God, but gives ſuch a reaſon why he could not worſhip him, as equally excludes all Creatures, whether good or bad Spirits, from any right to Divine Worſhip. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Him and none elſe, whether they be good or bad Spirits, for our Saviour does not confine his anſwer to either, and therefore includes them both.

When we charge the Church of *Rome* with too plain an imitation of the Pagan Idolatry in that worſhip they paid to their inferiour Dæmons, which was nothing more, than what the Church of *Rome* now gives to Saints and Angels; they think it a ſufficient anſwer, that the Heathens worſhipt Devils and Apoſtate Spirits, but they worſhip only the Friends and Favourites of God, bleſſed Saints and Angels.

Now I ſhall not at preſent examine the truth of this pretence, but ſhall refer my Reader to a more Learned perſon for ſatisfaction in this matter; but if it were true, yet it is nothing to the purpoſe, if our Saviours anſwer to the Devil be good.

Stillingfleets *Defence of the diſcourſe of Idolatry.*

For let us ſuppoſe, that the Pope of *Rome*, who calls himſelf Chriſts Vicar, had at this time been in Chriſt's ſtead to have anſwered the Devils temptations, and let us be ſo charitable for once as to ſuppoſe that (ſaving always his indirect power over the Kingdoms of this world *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*) he would not worſhip the Devil to gain all the Kingdoms of the World and the Glory of them,

them. Consider then, how the Pope of *Rome* could answer this Temptation; *All this I will give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me*: could he answer as our Saviour does? *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve.* How easily might the Devil reply, Is this indeed your infallible Opinion, and the judgment and practice of your Church *to serve God onely*? do you not also serve and worship St. *Paul* and St. *Peter*, and the Virgin *Mary*, besides a great many other obscure and doubtful Saints? This is down right Heresie to confine all Religious Worship to God; Here now is matter of fact against the Pope, that he does worship other Beings besides God, and if he will shew any reason for his not worshipping the Devil, he must quite alter our Saviours answer, and not plead for himself, that he is bound to worship God and him onely, but that he is bound to worship onely God and good Spirits; and therefore the Devil being a wicked and Apostate Spirit, it is not lawful to worship him. So that if our Saviour gave a sufficient answer to the Devils temptation, it must be equally unlawful to worship good and bad Spirits; there may be some peculiar aggravations in having communion with Devils, but the Idolatry of worshipping good and bad Spirits is the same.

3. Our Saviours answer to the Devil, appropriates all kinds and degrees of Religious Worship to God alone. The Devil was not then so good a Schoolman as nicely to distinguish & dispute the degrees of Religious Worship with our Saviour; but would have been contented with any degree of Religious Worship. He did not pretend to be the Supreme God, nor to have the disposal of all the Kingdoms of the world in his own right; but acknowledges, that *it was delivered to him*, and now by vertue of that grant, *he gives it to whom he will.*

4 Luke 6.

will. Now it is impossible in the nature of the thing to worship any Being as Supreme, whom at the same time, we acknowledge not to be Supreme. And therefore the Devil asks no more of our Saviour, than that *he would fall down and worship him*; which is such an inferiour degree of Worship, as Papists every day pay to Images and Saints; and yet this our Saviour refuses to do, and that for this reason, that we must worship God only, which must signifie, that we must not give the least degree of Divine Worship to any Creatures; or else it is not a satisfactory answer to the Devils Temptation, who did not require any certain and determinate degree of Worship, but left him at liberty to use what distinctions he pleased, and to pay what degree of Worship he saw fit; whether absolute or relative, supreme or subordinate, terminative or transient, so he would but fall down and worship him any way, or in any degree, he left him to be his own Schoolman and Casuist; but of this more presently.

II. As the Laws of *Moses* in general, appropriate all Religious Worship to God, command us to worship God, and him only, so the whole Jewish Religion was fitted only for the worship of the Lord *Jehovah*.

I suppose our Adversaries will not deny, that the Tabernacle and Temple at *Jerusalem* was peculiarly consecrated to the honour and worship of the Lord *Jehovah*: this was the house where he dwelt, where he placed his Name, and the Symbols of his presence. It was a great profanation of that holy place, to have the worship of any strange Gods set up in it; and yet this was the only place of Worship appointed by the Law of *Moses*; they had but one Temple to worship in, and this one Temple consecrated to the peculiar worship of one God: which is a plain demonstration, that they were not allowed to worship any other God, because they had no place to worship him in.

And this I think is a plain proof, that all that worship which was confined to their Temple, or related to it, was peculiar to the Lord *Jehovah*, because that was his house, and then all the Jewish worship was so, which was either to be performed at the Temple, or had a relation and dependance on the Temple worship.

Sacrifice was the principal part of the Jewish worship, and this we know was confined to the Temple. *Moses* expresly commands *Israel*, *Take heed to thy self, that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest. But in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy Tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there shalt thou do all that I command thee.* The Prophets indeed, especially before the building of the Temple, did erect Altars at other places for occasional Sacrifices, for as God reserved a liberty to himself to dispense with his own Law in extraordinary cases, so it was presumed, that what was done by Prophets, was done by a Divine command; but there was to be no ordinary or standing Altar for Sacrifice, but at the Tabernacle or Temple; this we may see in that dispute which had like to have hapned between the Children of *Israel* and the Tribes of *Reuben* and *Gad*, and the half Tribe of *Manasseh*, about the Altar of Testimony, which these two Tribes and a half built on the other side of *Jordan*. It was agreed on all hands, that had it been intended for an Altar for Sacrifice, it had been Rebellion against the Lord to have built any Altar beside the Altar of the Lord, though they had offered no Sacrifice but to the Lord *Jehovah*. The same is evident from Gods dislike of their offering Sacrifices in their high places, though they sacrificed only to the God of *Israel*. So that all Sacrifices were to be offered at the Temple on the Altar of God, and therefore were offered only to that God whose Temple and Altar it was. And indeed this is expresly

12 Deut. 13, 14.

22 Joshua.

v. 16. 19. 22, 23.

presly provided for in the Law. *He that sacrificeth to any God, but to the Lord only, shall be utterly destroyed.* 22 Exod. 20.

And as their Sacrifices were appropriated to the Temple, so in some sense were their Prayers, which were offered up in vertue of their Sacrifice. And therefore this is a peculiar name for the Temple, that it was *the House of Prayer.* Here God was more immediately present to hear those Prayers which were offered to him, according to *Solomons* Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple. 56 Isai. 7. 21. Matth. 13. 1 King 8.

It is true, the devout *Jews* did pray to God where ever they were, though at a great distance from the Temple, whether in the land of *Canaan*, or out of it; but then there are two things, which shew that relation their Prayers had to the Temple Worship. 1. That their stated hours of Prayer were the hours of Sacrifice, which plainly signified, that they offered up their Prayers in conjunction with those Sacrifices, which were at that time offered in the Temple; and therefore that they prayed only to that God to whom they sacrificed; for we must consider, that the constant morning and evening Sacrifices, were not particular Sacrifices, but were offered for the whole Congregation of *Israel*; and therefore every man had a share in them. Hence the time of offering the Sacrifice, is called the hour of Prayer. Thus *Peter and John went up together into the Temple, at the hour of Prayer, being the ninth hour*; that is the time of the Evening Sacrifice. 3 Acts 1. Hence are such expressions as that of the Psalmist, *Let my Prayer be set before thee as Incense, and the lifting up of my hands, as the Evening Sacrifice.* Nay, it is most probable, that when *Jerusalem* and the Temple were destroyed, and the people carryed captive into *Babylon*, and the daily Sacrifice ceast, yet the devout people observed the hour of Sacrifice for their Prayers. Thus *Daniel* prayed three times a day, which most likely were Evening and Morning,

6 Dan. 10. 55 Psalm. 17. and Noon. Where Evening and Morning no doubt signifie the time of the Evening and Morning Sacrifice; and we are told, that the Angel *Gabriel* came to *Daniel* 9. Dan. 21. while he was praying, and touched him about the time of the Evening oblation. But 2ly besides this, when they offered up their Prayers to God in other parts of the Nation, or in other Countries, they prayed towards *Jerusalem*, and the Temple of God, as we now lift up our eyes to Heaven, where God dwells. Thus *Solomon* in his Prayer of Dedication, does not only beg of God to hear those Prayers, which were made to him in that house, but those also which were made towards it, as the words must signifie in several places. In general he 1 Kings 8. 30. prays, *Hearken thou to the Prayer of thy servant, and of thy people* Israel, *when they shall pray towards this place*; אל־המקום may signifie both in and towards this place, and here includes both, as appears from the following instances, which refer both to Prayers made in the Temple, and to those Prayers which were made towards the Temple by persons who were at a distance. Thus in what ever part of the Nation they wanted rain, which might be at a great distance from *Jerusalem*, they were v. 35. to pray towards this place. The same was to be done in case of Famine and Pestilence, &c. or if they were besieged in any of their Cities, when they could not go v. 37. to the Temple to pray. Nay, *What Prayer or supplication soever shall be made by any man, or by all thy people* Israel, v. 39. *which shall know every man the plague of his own heart, and spread forth his hands towards this house, then hear thou in Heaven thy dwelling place and forgive.* Thus when they went out to battle, they were to pray to- v. 44. wards the City of *Jerusalem*, and towards the Temple. And when they were carryed captive into their enemies land, they were to pray to God toward the land which God had given them, towards the Holy City, and to-

wards

wards the Temple. And accordingly it was the constant practice of *Daniel*, when he was in *Babylon*, to pray three times a day to God, with his windows open in his chamber toward *Jerusalem*. v. 48. 6. Dan. 10.

So that though the Temple were not the onely place where they might lawfully pray to God; yet all their Prayers were to be directed to the Temple, and receive their vertue and acceptation from their relation to the Temple and the Temple-Worship. This was a standing rule for the whole Jewish Nation, that whenever they prayed, they offered up their prayers in the Temple or towards it; and this is generally observed by them to this day: For the reason why they generally now turn themselves towards the East when they pray, is not out of any respect to the rising of the Sun, but because they live in Western Countries; and so by turning to the East, they look towards *Jerusalem*, and the place where the Temple stood. And this is as plain evidence, that all their Prayers as well as Sacrifices, were to be offered onely to that God who dwelt in the Temple. And therefore as they are commanded to pray to God, and this is made the peculiar attribute of God, *that he heareth prayers, and therefore unto him shall all flesh come*; so they are expresly commanded *not to make mention of the name of the Heathen gods*; that is, not to pray to them; the prayers of the Heathens consisting of a frequent repetition of the names of their gods, as we see in the priests of *Baal*, who cried from morning till evening, saying, *O Baal hear us*. Buxtorfii Synag. Jud. p. 222. 65. Psalm. 2. 23 Josua 7. 1 Kings 18. 26.

Thus the Jews were commanded to bring all their Vows, first Fruits, Tythes, and Offerings, to the Temple, which is a plain sign to whom they were offered. The Seventh-day-Sabbath was a sign that they worshipt that God who created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, and delivered them from their Ægypti-

an

an Bondage, and gave them reſt in that good Land, both which reaſons are aſſigned by *Moſes*, and therefore God commands them by the Prophet *Ezekiel*, *Hallow my ſabbaths, and they ſhall be a ſign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.*

20 Ezek. 20.

They had but three ſolemn Feſtivals every year, and they were all in remembrance of the great Works of God, and all the Males were to go up to *Jeruſalem* to keep theſe Feaſts; and therefore all theſe were the Feaſts of the Lord *Jehovah*.

And as they were to pray onely to God, ſo they were onely to ſwear by his Name, which is another part of Religious Worſhip; and therefore to ſwear by the Lord of Hoſts is called the Language of *Canaan*.

10 Deut 21.
19 Iſai. 18.

So that all the parts of the Jewiſh Worſhip were appropriated to the Lord Jehovah, he was the onely object of their dread and fear, and religious Adorations. And when we conſider that God had choſen them to be a peculiar people to himſelf, that the Land was a Holy Land, Gods peculiar Inheritance, which he gave by promiſe to their Fathers, and the Temple was his Houſe where he dwelt among them, it cannot be expected that any other Gods might be worſhipt by ſuch a people, in ſuch a Land, and in ſuch a houſe, as God had appropriated to himſelf.

3. It is very conſiderable, that we have no approved example under the Law, of any worſhip pay'd to Saints or Angels, or any other Being, but God alone. We have too many ſad examples of the Idolatry of the Jews both in worſhipping the Molten Calf which *Aaron* made, and *Jeroboams* Calves, and *Baalim's*, and other Heathen gods; but had it been allowed by their Law to have pay'd any inferiour degree of Religious Worſhip to Saints and Angels (which is now aſſerted by the Church of *Rome*, to be a matter of ſuch great benefit and advantage

tage to mankind) it is very ſtrange, that we ſhould not have one example of it throughout the Scripture, nor any authentick Records among the Jewiſh Writers: All the Pſalms of *David* are directed to God alone, and yet we cannot think but ſuch a devout man would have beſtowed ſome Hymns upon his Patron and tutelar Saints, had he worſhipt any ſuch, as well as the Papiſts do now.

This the Church of *Rome* ſees and acknowledges, and thinks ſhe anſwers too, when ſhe gives us the reaſon why it could not be ſo under the Law; becauſe thoſe Old Teſtament-Saints were not then admitted into Heaven, to the immediate viſion and fruition of God; Heaven-gates were not opened till the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of our Saviour, and therefore thoſe bleſſed Spirits were not in a condition to be our Interceſſors and Mediators, till they were received into Heaven; but now Saints and Martyrs deſcend directly into Heaven, and reign with Chriſt in Glory, and it ſeems ſhare with him in his peculiar Worſhip and Glory too.

Now 1. Whether this be ſo or not, the Scriptures aſſign no ſuch reaſon for it; and therefore it is likely there might be other reaſons, and I think I have made it very plain that there was. We are not enquiring for what reaſons the Jewiſh Church did not worſhip Saints and Angels, but whether they did worſhip them or not; and it appears that they never did: ſo that we have neither precept nor example for this, during all the time of the Jewiſh Church; which is all we intend to prove by this argument.

2. But yet it is evident, that this is not a good reaſon why the Jews did not worſhip Angels under the Law. For certainly Angels were as much in Heaven then, as they are now, whatever Saints were. They are repreſented in the Old Teſtament as the conſtant Attendants and Retinue of God, and the great Miniſters of his Pro-

Providence, and therefore they were as capable of Divine Worship in the time of the Law, as they are now, nay, I think, a little more. For the Law it self was given by the Ministry of Angels, and their appearances were more frequent and familiar, and the world seemed to be more under the Government of Angels then, than it is now, since Christ is made the Head of the Church, and exalted above all principalities and powers.

And therefore sometimes the Advocates of the Church of *Rome*, make some little offers to prove the worship of Angels in those days: to this purpose they alledge that form of Benediction, which *Jacob* used in blessing the
48 Gen. 16. Sons of *Joseph*: *The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the Lads.*

But 1. This is not a direct prayer to the Angel, but onely his committing of them to the care and patronage of that Angel, with a prayer to God for that purpose: And if he by experience had found that God had appointed his Angel to defend and protect him, it was but reasonable to pray to God, that the same Angel might protect his posterity.

2. But yet according to the sense of the Antient Fathers, this was no created Angel and Spirit, but the Son and Word of God, the Angel of the presence, who is so often in Scripture stiled *Jehovah*, a name which can belong to no created Spirit. And it is no hard matter to make it highly probable, that this is that Angel who redeemed *Jacob* out of all his troubles. But is it strange if Angels were worshipt under the Old Testament, we should have no clearer and plainer evidence of it, than such a single Text, which was never expounded either by any Jewish or Christian Writers, to this sense, till of late days; and here the Priests of the Church of *Rome* are to be put in mind of their Oath to Expound Scripture according to the unanimous consent of the Antient Fathers.

Sect.

SECT. III.

The Teſtimonies of the Goſpel conſidered; whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles have made any alteration in the object of our Worſhip.

LEt us now proceed in the ſecond place, to conſider the writings of the New Teſtament, and examine what they teach us concerning the object of our Worſhip. And that Chriſt and his Apoſtles have made no change in the object of our worſhip, will appear from theſe conſiderations. *Sect.* 3.

1. That they could not do it. Had they ever attempted to ſet up the worſhip of any other Beings beſides the One Supreme God, the Lord *Jehovah*, the *Jews* were expreſſly commanded by their Law not to believe them, nor hearken to them, whatever ſigns and wonders and miracles they had wrought. *If there ariſe among you a Prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a ſign or wonder, and the ſign or wonder come to paſs, whereof he ſpake unto thee ſaying, let us go after other Gods (which thou haſt not known) and let us ſerve them; Thou ſhalt not hearken unto the words of the Prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your Soul. Ye ſhall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his Commandments, and obey his voice, and you ſhall ſerve him, and cleave unto him. And that Prophet or dreamer of dreams ſhall be put to death*, &c. in which Law there are ſome things very material to be obſerved in this preſent diſpute. 13 Deut. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

1. When they are forbidden to hearken to any Prophet, who ſeduces them to the worſhip of any other Gods, this muſt be extended to all thoſe inſtances of Idolatrous worſhip, which are forbid by the Law of *Moſes*, whatever is oppoſed to the worſhip of one Supreme and Soveraign Being, the Lord *Jehovah*. And therefore whether theſe Prophets ſeduced them from the worſhip of the Lord *Jehovah*, to the worſhip of other Gods; or perſwaded them to worſhip other Gods beſides the Lord *Jehovah*, whether they were any of thoſe Gods which were at that time worſhipt by other Nations, or any other Gods, whom the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the people ſhould create in after ages, whether good or bad Spirits, the caſe is the ſame; whoever perſwaded them to worſhip any other Being with or beſides the Supreme God, was to be rejected by them; for this is the ſenſe of the Moſaical Laws concerning the worſhip of one Supreme God, as I have already proved, and the ſerving other Gods in this place, is oppoſed to the worſhip of one God, and therefore muſt include whatever according to the Law of *Moſes* is contrary to the worſhip of one Supreme Being.

2. This Law makes the worſhip of one God eternal and unchangeable. There is no way of altering any Divine Laws, but by a new revelation of Gods will, and there is no way to give Authority to ſuch a revelation, but by Miracles or Propheſie; but in this caſe Miracles and Propheſie it ſelf can give no authority, becauſe God himſelf has expreſly forbid us to hearken to any Prophet, whatever ſigns or wonders are wrought by him, who teacheth the worſhip of any other Being beſides the one Supreme God. So that the Law of *Moſes* having expreſly forbid the worſhip of any other Being beſides God, and as expreſly forbid us to hearken to any Prophet, though a worker of Miracles, who teaches any other worſhip,

worſhip, it is impoſſible, that this Law ſhould ever be altered, becauſe we are before-hand warned by God himſelf, not to give credit to any Prophet, whatever he be, or whatever he do, who attempts any alteration of it. And therefore had Chriſt or his Apoſtles taught the worſhip of Saints and Angels, it had been a juſt reaſon for the unbelief of the *Jews*, notwithſtanding all the Miracles that were wrought by them; and it is well the *Jews* never had any juſt occaſion to make this objection againſt our Saviour; for if they had, I know not how it would have been anſwered. I ſay a *juſt occaſion*, for the *Jews* did urge this very Law againſt him before *Pilate*. *We have a Law, and by our Law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the Son of God.* In which they refer to that diſcourſe of our Saviour, 10. *John* 29, 30. where he affirms that God is his Father, and plainly tells them, *I and my Father are one*, for which ſaying they attempt to ſtone him for Blaſphemy, and that being a man, he made himſelf a God. *v.* 33. But though he did indeed (as the *Jews* rightly inferred) make himſelf a God by this ſaying, yet he did not preach any new God to them, but affirmed himſelf to be one with his Father, that ſame Supreme God, the Lord *Jehovah*, whom they were commanded to worſhip by their Law; he made no alteration in the object of their worſhip, but only did more clearly and diſtinctly reveal the Father to them, as manifeſting himſelf in and by his only begotten Son. And therefore he did not offend againſt this Law, by ſeducing them to the worſhip of any other Gods beſides the Lord *Jehovah*; which if he had done, their accuſation had been juſt, and all the Miracles which he did, could not have ſecured him from the guilt and puniſhment of an Impoſtor. 19. John 7.

Which ſhews us, what force there is in that Argument, which the Church of *Rome* urges from thoſe Miracles:

which have been wrought at the Tombs of Martyrs, to prove the Religious invocation of them; if such Miracles were ever wrought, it was in testimony to the truth of Christianity, for which they suffered, not to betray men to a superstitious and idolatrous worship of them; ten thousand Miracles should never convince me of the lawfulness of praying to Saints departed, while I have such a plain and express Law against believing all Miracles upon any such account.

Nor can it reasonably be said, that this Law was given only to the *Jews*, and therefore obliges none but them; for we must remember, that Christ was originally sent to the *Jews*, to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*; and therefore by this Law, he was bound not to teach the worship of any other Beings, under the penalty of death; and they were bound not to own and receive him if he did; and therefore it was impossible for the true Messias to introduce the worship of any Being, besides the one Supreme God; and if Christ could not teach any such Doctrine, I know not how the worship of Saints and Angels should ever come to be a Doctrine of Christianity. For what Christ himself cannot do, none of his Followers may, who had no other Commission but to teach those things which they had learnt from him; and he could not give commission to preach such Doctrines, as he himself had no authority to preach.

So that though this Law was not originally given to the Gentiles, but only to the Jews; yet it equally obliges the Christian Church, whether Jews or Gentiles, because Christ himself, who was the Author of our Religion was obliged by it. The worship of one Supreme God, and of none else, is as fundamental to Christianity, as it is to Judaism; for Christianity is now, or ought to be, the Religion of the Jews, as well as Gentiles; and yet the Jews are expressly forbid by this Law ever to

own any Religion, which allows the worſhip of any Being beſides God: and therefore the worſhip of one God and none elſe, muſt be fundamental in Chriſtianity, if the people of the Jews are, or ever were bound to embrace the Faith of Chriſt.

SECT. IV.

2. AND therefore I obſerve in the next place, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles have made no alteration at all in the object of our worſhip. Chriſt urges, that Old Teſtament Law in anſwer to the Devils Temptation; *It is written, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Which it ſeems, is as ſtanding a Law after the appearance of Chriſt, as it was before. He gives no other direction to his Diſciples, but to pray to their Heavenly Father, and in that form of prayer which he gave them, he teaches them to addreſs their prayer neither to Saints nor Angels, but to God onely. *Our Father which art in heaven.* 4 Matth. 10.

When St. *Paul* charges the Heathens with Idolatry, he does it upon this account, that they joyned the worſhip of Creatures, with the worſhip of the Supreme God. *Becauſe that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their fooliſh heart was darkned.* Where the Apoſtle acknowledges, that they did know God, that they did own that Supreme and Soveraign Being who made the world; and does ſuppoſe, that they did worſhip him alſo. For he does not charge them with renouncing the worſhip of that God who made the world, but that they did *not glorifie him as God*; which only taxes the manner of their worſhip. And wherein that was faulty he declares in the following verſes. As that they made mean and vile repreſentations of him, that *they* 1 Rom. 21.

changed

v. 23. *changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into an Image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four footed beasts, and creeping things.* And thus *changed the truth of God into a lie.* But this was not the only fault, but they also gave his incommunicable worship to Creatures, *and worshipped and served the Creature more than the Cre-*
v. 25. *ator, who is blessed for ever, Amen.* Which words do plainly suppose, that they did worship the Creator of all things, but besides the Creator, (for so παρὰ may signifie) they worshipped the Creature also; which proves that the worship of the Supreme God will not excuse those from Idolatry, who worship any thing else besides him. For the opposition lies between the Creator, and the Creature, be it a good or a bad Creature, it matters not as to Religious Worship, which must be given to neither. Or if we render the words, as our Translators do, *more than the Creator*, (for παρὰ is often used comparatively) yet so it supposes, that they did worship the Creator, and when they are said to worship the Creature *more*, that cannot signifie a higher degree of worship, but more frequent addresses; and thus the Church of *Rome* worships the Virgin *Mary*, more than the Creator; for they say ten prayers (if they be prayers) to the Virgin *Mary* for one to God; ten *Ave Maries* for one *Pater noster*.

The same Apostle determines this matter in as plain
1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. words as can be: *For though there be, that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many; but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Where in opposition to the Pagan Idolatry, who worshipt a great many Gods, not as Supreme Independent Deities (for they acknowledged but one Supreme God, who made all the other Gods) but either as sharers in the Government of the World, or Mediators and Intercessors

for

for them with the Supreme God, the Apoſtle plainly aſſerts, That to us Chriſtians there is but one God the Maker of all Things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt our great Mediator and Advocate with God the Father; that is, that we muſt worſhip none elſe. And that none of the diſtinctions, which are uſed by the Church of *Rome* to juſtifie that Worſhip, which they pay to Saints and Angels, can have any place here, is evident from this conſideration: For either theſe diſtinctions were known, or they were not known, when the Apoſtle wrote this, and in both caſes his ſilence is an argument againſt them. If they were known, he rejects them, and determines againſt them; for he affirms abſolutely without the *ſalvo* of any diſtinctions, that we have but one God, and one Mediator; that is, that we muſt worſhip no more. If they were not known (as it is likely they were not, becauſe the Apoſtle takes no notice of them) it is a plain argument, that theſe diſtinctions are of no uſe, unleſs they will ſay, that St. *Paul*, who was guided by an Infallible Spirit, was ignorant of ſome very uſeful and material notions about the object of Worſhip. If the Apoſtle did not know theſe diſtinctions, it is evident they are of a late date, and therefore can have no authority againſt an Apoſtolical determination: If he did not know them, he could have no regard to them, and therefore made no allowance for ſuch exceptions.

Nay, the ſame Apoſtle does not only give us ſuch general rules, as neceſſarily exclude the worſhip of Saints and Angels, but does expreſly condemn it, and warns the Chriſtians againſt it. He foretels of the Apoſtaſie of the latter days, wherein *ſome ſhall depart from the Faith, giving heed to ſeducing Spirits, and the doctrine of Devils*, διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, the doctrine of Dæmons, the doctrine of worſhipping Dæmons, or ſome new inferiour Deity, Saints, or Angels, or whatever they are, as Mediators. 1 Tim. 4. 1.

diators and Interceſſors between God and men. This is the true notion of the doctrine of Dæmons amongſt the Heathens, and the Apoſtle tells us, the time ſhall come, when ſome Chriſtians (for it is evident he ſpeaks here of the Apoſtaſie of Chriſtians) ſhall fall into the ſame Idolatry; which is an exact prophecy of what we now ſee done in the Church of *Rome*, who have the ſame notion of their Saints and Angels, and pay the ſame worſhip to them, which the Heathens formerly did to their Dæmons or inferiour Gods.

See Mr. Joſeph Medes *Apoſtaſie of the latter times.*

3. And as a further confirmation of this, I obſerve, that the Goſpel of our Saviour forbids Idolatry, without giving us any new notion of Idolatry; and therefore it has made no alteration at all in this Doctrine, of the worſhip of one God, which *Moſes* ſo expreſly commanded the Jews to obſerve. For the Goſpel was preacht to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles; nay, the Jews had the firſt and moſt undoubted right to it, as being the poſterity of *Abraham*, to whom the promiſe of the Meſſias was made; and therefore as the Law was at firſt given them by *Moſes*, ſo it did ſtill oblige them in all ſuch caſes, wherein the Goſpel did not in expreſs terms make a change and alteration of the Law; and therefore ſince there was no ſuch alteration made, and yet the Law againſt Idolatry renewed and confirmed by the authority of the Goſpel, what could the Jews underſtand elſe by Idolatry, but what was accounted Idolatry by the Law of *Moſes*; that is, the worſhip of any other Being beſides the Supreme God; the Lord *Jehovah*. And ſince it is evident, that there are not two Goſpels, one for the Jews, and another for the Gentiles, all Chriſtians, whether Jews or Gentiles, muſt be under the obligation of the ſame Law, to worſhip only one God.

The notion of Idolatry muſt alter as the object of Re-

Religious Worſhip does. If we muſt worſhip one God, and none beſides him, then it is Idolatry to worſhip any other Being but the Supreme God; for Idolatry conſiſts in giving Religious Worſhip to ſuch Beings, as we ought not to worſhip; and by the Law of *Moſes* they were to worſhip none but God; and therefore the worſhip of any other Being was Idolatry. But if the object of our worſhip be enlarged, and the Goſpel has made it lawful to worſhip Saints and Angels, then we muſt ſeek out ſome other notion of Idolatry, that it conſiſts in worſhipping wicked Spirits, or in giving Supreme and Soveraign worſhip to inferiour Deities, which the Church of *Rome* thinks impoſſible in the nature of the thing, for any man to do, who knows them to be inferiour Spirits. But if Idolatry be the ſame under the New Teſtament, that it was under the Old, the object of our worſhip muſt be the ſame too; and we have reaſon to believe, that it is the ſame, when we are commanded to keep our ſelves from Idols, and to flie from Idolatry, but are no where in the New Teſtament expreſly told, what this Idolatry is; which ſuppoſes, that we muſt learn what it is, from ſome antecedent Laws, and there were no ſuch Laws in being but the Laws of *Moſes*.

The only thing that can be ſaid in this caſe, is, that the Apoſtle refers them not to any written Law, but to the natural notions of Idolatry: but with what reaſon this is ſaid, will ſoon appear, if we conſider to whom the Apoſtle writes; and they were both Jewiſh and Heathen Converts. As for the Heathens, they had corrupted all their natural notions of Idolatry, and had no ſenſe at all of this ſin till they were converted to Chriſtianity; and therefore they were not likely to underſtand the true notion of Idolatry without being taught it; and it is not probable the Apoſtles would leave them to gueſs what Idolatry is. As for the

Jews, God would not from the beginning truſt to their natural notions, but gave them expreſs Laws about Idolatry, which though they are the ſame Laws which natural reaſon dictates to us, as moſt agreeable to the nature and worſhip of God, yet ſince the experience of the world, which was over-run by Idolatrous worſhip, did ſufficiently prove, that all men do not uſe their reaſon aright in theſe matters, God would not truſt to the uſe of their reaſon in the weighty concernments of his own worſhip and glory, but gives them an expreſs poſitive Law about it; and Chriſt and his Apoſtles having done nothing to repeal this Law, they leave them under the authority of it; and when they warn them againſt Idols and Idolatry, without giving them any new Laws about it, muſt in all reaſon be preſumed to refer them to thoſe Laws, which they already had.

SECT. V.

4. AS a farther proof of this, I obſerve, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did not abrogate, but only complete and perfect the Moſaical Laws. Our Saviour with great zeal and earneſtneſs diſowns any ſuch intention or
5. Mat. 17. deſign. *Think not that I am come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, I am not come to deſtroy but to fulfil.* πληρῶσαι to fill it up, by fulfilling the types and propheſies of it, by exchanging a ceremonial for a real righteouſneſs, or by perfecting its moral precepts with new inſtances and degrees of vertue. And therefore he adds, *For verily I ſay unto you, Till heaven and earth paſs, one jot or one tittle ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be fulfilled.* And St. *Paul*, who was lookt on by the believing Jews as a great enemy to the Law of *Moſes*, does re-
21. Acts 21, 22. nounce all ſuch pretences. *Do we then make void the*

Law

Law through Faith? God forbid; yea, we eſtabliſh the Law. 3. Rom. 31,

Indeed had Chriſt or his Apoſtles attempted to have given any new Laws contrary to the Laws of *Moſes*, it had juſtified the Jews in their unbelief, for God by his Propheſt *Iſaiah*, had given them this expreſs rule to examine all new Doctrines by; *To the law and the teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them*; and that Chriſt himſelf is not excepted from this rule, appears in this, that this is joyned with the propheſie of the Meſſias, both before and after; as you may ſee in 8 *Iſai.* 13, 14. and 9 *Chap.* 6, 7. and therefore Chriſt and his Apoſtles always make their appeals to the writings of the Old Teſtament, and St. *Paul* in all his diſputes with the Jews urges them with no other authority but the Scriptures; and thô the Miracles which were wrought by the Apoſtles did move the Jews to hearken to them, and greatly diſpoſe them to believe their Doctrine, yet it was the authority of the Scriptures whereon their Faith was founded. As St. *Peter* tells thoſe to whom he wrote, that though they preacht nothing to them concerning the coming of Chriſt, but what they were eye-witneſſes of; and though God had given teſtimony to him by a voice from Heaven, which they heard, when they were with him in the holy Mount, yet he adds, *We have alſo a more ſure word of propheſie, whereunto ye do well, that ye take heed, as to a light, that ſhineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-ſtar ariſe in your hearts.* That is the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; and therefore the Jews of *Berea* are greatly commended for their diligence in ſearching the Scriptures, and examining St. *Pauls* Doctrine by them; and this is aſſigned as the reaſon why many of them believed. 8. Iſai. 20. 2 Pet. 1. 16, 17, 18, 19. 17. Acts 10, 11.

To apply this then to our preſent purpoſe, I obſerve,

1. That if Christ did not make any new Laws in contradiction to the Law of *Moses*, then he could make no alteration in the object of Religious Worship. He could not introduce the worship of Saints and Angels without contradicting that Law, which commands us to worship no other Being but the one Supreme God. For the worship of Saints and Angels together with the Supreme God, is a direct contradiction to that Law, which commands us to worship God alone; though we should suppose, that in the nature of the thing, the worship of Saints and Angels were consistent with the worship of the Supreme God, yet it is not consistent with that Law, which commands us to worship none but God. So that let this be a natural or positive Law, or whatever men please to call it, it is a very plain and express Law, and Christ never did contradict any express Law of God.

It is true, that Typical and Ceremonial Worship, which God commanded the Jews to observe, is now out of date under the Gospel, and does no longer oblige Christians; but the reason of that is, because it has received its accomplishment and perfection in Christ. Christ has perfected the Jewish Sacrifices, and put an end to them, by offering a more perfect and meritorious sacrifice, even the sacrifice of himself. The Circumcision, Washings, Purifications of the Law, are perfected by the Laws of internal purity. The external Ceremonies of the Law cease, but they are perfected by an Evangelical righteousness. But this I say, that Christ never repealed any Mosaical Law, but by fulfilling and perfecting it. He came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil. Now methinks I need not prove, that the worship of Saints and Angels is not a fulfilling, but a destroying that Law, which commands us to worship none but God. And it is not enough to say, that these are positive Laws given

to

to the Jews, (though that be ſaid without any reaſon) for let them ſhew me any poſitive Law relating to the Worſhip of God, which Chriſt has wholly abrogated without fulfilling it.

2. Yet as a farther proof, that Chriſt has made no alteration in the object of our worſhip, that he has not introduced the worſhip of Saints or Angels, or Images, into the Chriſtian Church, which was ſo expreſly forbid by the Jewiſh Law, I obſerve that according to our Saviours own rule, that *he came not to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil*; theſe Laws of worſhipping one God, and none beſides him, were not lyable to any change and alteration, becauſe there was nothing to be perfected or fulfilled in them. He made no change or alteration but by way of perfecting and fulfilling; and therefore thoſe Laws which had nothing to be fulfilled, muſt remain as they were without any change.

To perfect or fulfil a Law, muſt either ſignifie to accompliſh what was prefigured by it, and thus Chriſt fulfilled all the types and propheſies of the Law, which related to his Perſon, or his undertaking, as the Jewiſh Prieſthood, and Sacrifices, &c. or to preſcribe that real righteouſneſs which was ſignified and repreſented by the outward ceremony, and ſo Chriſt fulfilled the Laws of Circumciſion, Waſhings, Purifications, Sabbaths, &c. by commanding the Circumciſion of the heart, and the purity of mind and ſpirit: or by ſupplying what was defective; and thus he fulfilled the moral Law by new inſtances of vertue, by requiring ſomething more perfect of us, than what the letter of the Moſaical Law enjoyned. Theſe are all the ways that I know of, and all that we have any inſtances of in Scripture of fulfilling Laws.

Now I ſuppoſe, no man will ſay, that the firſt Commandment, which forbids the worſhip of any other Gods beſides the Lord *Jehovah*, is a Typical Law, for pray what

what is it a Type of? nor can any pretend that the first Commandment is a Ceremonial Law, for it prescribes no rite of worship at all, but only determines the object of worship.

As for the third way of fulfilling Laws, by perfecting them with some new instances and degrees of vertue, it can have no place here, for this Law is as perfect as it can be. For it is a Negative Law, *Thou shalt have none other God.* Now that which is forbid without any reserve or limitation, is perfectly and absolutely forbid. There are no degrees of nothing, though there are several degrees of perfection in things which have a being; and therefore though there are degrees in affirmative Laws, for some Laws may require greater attainments than other; and one man may do better than another, and yet both do that which is good; yet there are no degrees in not doing a thing, and no Law can do more than forbid that, which the Law-giver will not have done.

And besides, this way of fulfilling Laws, does not abrogate any command, but adds to it; it may restrain those liberties which were formerly indulged, but it does not forbid any thing which was formerly our duty to do; for when God requires greater degrees of vertue from us, he does not forbid the less. And therefore in this way, Christ might forbid more than was forbid by the Law of *Moses*, but we cannot suppose that he gave liberty to do that which the Law forbids, which is not to perfect, but to abrogate a Law.

But to put an end to this dispute; if Christ have perfected these Laws by indulging the worship of Saints and Angels under the Gospel, which was so expresly forbidden by the Law, then it seems the worship of Saints and Angels is a more perfect state of Religion, than the worship of the one Supreme God alone.

If this be true, then though the Heathens might mi-

stake

ſtake in the object of their Worſhip; yet the manner of their worſhip was more perfect and excellent, than what God himſelf preſcribed the Jews. For they worſhipt a great many inferiour Deities, as well as the Supreme God; and if this be the moſt perfect and excellent worſhip, it is wonderful to me, that God ſhould forbid it in the worſhip of himſelf; that he ſhould preſcribe a more imperfect worſhip to his own people, than the Heathens paid to their Gods.

For to ſay that God forbade the worſhip of any Being beſides himſelf, becauſe this liberty had been abuſed by the Heathens to Idolatry, is no reaſon at all. For though we ſhould ſuppoſe that the Heathens worſhipt evil ſpirits for Gods, this had been eaſily prevented, had God told them what Saints and Angels they ſhould have made their addreſſes to; and this had been a more likely way to cure them of Idolatry, than to have forbad the worſhip of all inferiour Deities; for when they had ſuch numerous Deities of their own, to have made their application to, they would have been more eaſily weaned from the Gods of other Countries.

And we have reaſon to believe, ſo it would have been, had God been pleaſed with this way of Worſhip, for he would not reject any part of Religious Worſhip, meerly becauſe it had been abuſed by Idolaters. The Heathens ſacrificed to Idols, and yet he commands the Jews to offer Sacrifices to himſelf, and ſo no doubt he would have commanded the worſhip of Saints and Angels, had he been as well pleaſed with this, as he was with Sacrifices; had it been a more perfect ſtate of Religion than to worſhip God only, and without any Image.

When God choſe the people of *Iſrael*, and ſeparated them from the reſt of the world, to his own peculiar worſhip and ſervice, we cannot ſuppoſe that he did intend to forbid any acts of worſhip, which were a real

honour

honour to the Divine Nature, much leſs to forbid the moſt excellent and perfect acts of worſhip; for he who is ſo jealous of his glory, will no more part with it himſelf, then he will give it to another; and therefore excepting the Typical nature of that diſpenſation, the whole intention of the Moſaical Law was to correct thoſe abuſes, which the reſt of the world was guilty of in their Religious Worſhip, which either reſpected the object or the acts of worſhip; that they worſhipt that for God, which was not God; or that they thought to honour God by ſuch acts, as were ſo far from being an honour, that they were a reproach to the Divine Nature. And whatever is forbid in the worſhip of God, unleſs there be ſome Myſtical and Typical reaſons for it, muſt be reduced to one of thoſe cauſes. This account God himſelf gives, why he forbids the worſhip of any Being beſides himſelf, or the worſhip of graven Images. *I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my glory will I not give to another, nor my praiſe to graven Images.* Whatever is his true glory, he reſerves to himſelf, and therefore never did forbid any act of worſhip which was truly ſo; but he will not give his glory to another, and for that reaſon forbids the worſhip of graven Images, or any thing beſides himſelf; and if this was not his glory then, much leſs the moſt perfect and excellent part of worſhip, I know not how it ſhould come to be his glory now, unleſs the Divine Nature changes and alters too.

42. Iſai. 8.

So that Gods having forbid by the Law of *Moſes* the worſhip of any other Being beſides himſelf, is a very ſtrong preſumption, that the worſhip of Saints and Angels, (whatever fine excuſes and Apologies may be made for it, yet at leaſt) is not a more perfect ſtate of Religion, than to worſhip God alone. For though God may not always think fit to command the higheſt degrees of perfection, yet there never can be any reaſon to forbid

it.

it. But let us now consider the nature and reason of the thing, whether it be a more perfect state of Religion to worship God alone, or to worship Saints and Angels, &c. together with the Supreme God. Now the perfection of any acts of Religion must either respect God or our selves, that they signifie some greater perfections in God, or more perfect attainments in us, and a nearer union and conjunction with the Deity. Let us then briefly examine the worship of Saints and Angels, both with respect to God and our selves, and see whether we can discover any greater perfection in this way of worship, than in the worship of the Supreme Being alone, without any Rival or partner in worship; and if it appears, that it is neither for the glory of God, nor for the happiness and perfection of those, who worship, we may certainly conclude, that our Saviour has made no alteration in the object of our worship, for he made no alteration for the worse but for the better; he fulfils and perfects Laws, which, I suppose, does not signifie making them less perfect than they were before.

SECT. VI.

1. THen let us consider, whether the worship of Saints and Angels be more for the glory of God, than to pay all Religious Worship to God alone. Now if Religious Worship be for the glory of God, then all Religious Worship is more for Gods glory than a part of it; unless men will venture to say, that a part is as great as the whole. And yet whoever worships Saints and Angels, though he be never so devout a worshipper of God also, yet he gives part of Religious Worship to Creatures, and therefore God cannot have the whole, unless they can divide their worship between God and Creatures, and yet give the whole to God.

If it be objected, that those who worship Saints and Angels, do not give that worship to them, which is peculiar and appropriate to the Supreme God, and therefore they reserve that worship which is due to God, wholly to himself, though they pay an inferiour degree of Religious Worship to Saints and Angels. I answer, what that worship is, which is peculiar to the Supreme God, I shall consider more hereafter; but for the present, supposing that they give only an inferiour degree of worship to Creatures, is this Religious Worship, or is it not; if it be, is a degree of Worship a part of Worship; if it be, then God has not the whole, and therefore is not so much honoured, as if he had the whole; as to shew this in a plain instance.

Those who pray to Saints and Angels, though they do not pray to them, as to the Supreme God; but as to Mediators and Intercessors for them with the Supreme God, yet they place an inferiour degree of hope and trust and affiance in them, or else it is non-sence to pray to them at all; so that though God may be the Supreme Object of their relyance and hope, yet he is not the only Object; he has part, and the greatest part, but not the whole, for they divide their hope and trust between God and Creatures; and if it be a greater glory to God to trust wholly in him, than to trust in him in part, then it is a greater glory to God to pray to him only, than to pray also to Saints and Angels.

Nay it is more than probable, that those who pray to Saints and Angels, as trusting in their merits and intercession for them, do not make God, but these Saints and Angels, to whom they pray, the Supreme Object of their hope. This it may be will be thought an extravagant charge against men who profess to believe, that God is the Supreme Lord of the world, and the sole giver of all good things; but this is no argument to me, but

that

that notwithstanding this belief, they may trust more in Saints and Angels, than in God, and consequently give the Supreme Worship to them. For men do not always trust most in those who have the greatest power, but in those by whose interest and intercession, they hope to obtain their desires of the Soveraign power. Thus I am sure it is in the Courts of earthly Princes, though men know, that the King only has power to grant what they desire, yet they place more confidence in a powerful Favorite than in their Prince, and when they have obtained their requests, pay more solemn acknowledgments to their Patron; for let the power be where it will, our hope and trust is plac't there where our expectations are. And when mens expectations are not from the Prince, who has the power, but from the Favourite, whose interest directs the influences of this power to them, which otherwise would never have reacht them, such Favourites have more numerous dependants, more frequent addresses, more formal courtships, than the Prince himself. And when men model the heavenly Court according to the pattern of earthly Courts, and expect the conveyance of the Divine Blessings to them as much from the intercession of Saints and Angels, as they do to obtain their desires of their Prince, by the mediation of some powerful Favourite, no wonder if they love, and honour, and fear, reverence and adore, trust and depend on Saints and Angels, as much or more than they do on the Supreme God. For there is not a more natural notion than to honour those for our Gods, from whose hands we receive all good things, whether we receive it from their own inherent power or not.

Deus nobis hæc otia fecit,
Namque erit ille mihi semper Deus, illius aram
Sæpe tener nostris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus.

Men may acknowledge God to be the Supreme Being,

and aſcribe incommunicable perfections to him, and yet may pray more frequently, more devoutly, more ardently, with greater truſt and affiance to Saints and Angels, than to God, as it is apparent many Devotoes of the Virgin *Mary* do; and this is to give Supreme and Soveraign Worſhip to them, without acknowledging them to be Supreme Beings.

Indeed it is morally impoſſible, but our Religious Worſhip, truſt and affiance, muſt be at leaſt equally ſhared between the Supreme God and our Mediator, whatever he be, as men do not leſs truſt in the intereſt of their Patron, than in the power of their Prince; for it is not meer power but favour, which is the immediate object of our truſt; and therefore God appointed his only begotten Son to be our Mediator, as for other great and wiſe reaſons, ſo to prevent Idolatry by giving us a God incarnate, who is a proper object of Religious adoration, to be our Mediator, that ſeeing men will worſhip their Mediator, they may have a God for their Mediator to worſhip. The ſum is this: If it be more for the glory of God to have all Religious Worſhip appropriated to himſelf, than to have only a part of it, and it may be the leaſt ſhare and part too, then the worſhip of Saints and Angels cannot be for Gods glory.

But beſides this, the worſhip of Saints and Angels, together with God, does mightily obſcure and leſſen the Divine perfections, and therefore it cannot be for his glory. It repreſents him indeed like a great Temporal Monarch, but it does not repreſent him like a God.

That which we ignorantly think a piece of ſtate and greatneſs in earthly Monarchs, to adminiſter the great affairs of their Kingdoms, to receive Petitions and Addreſſes, to beſtow Favours, to adminiſter Juſtice by other hands, to have ſome great Miniſters and Favourites to interpoſe between them and their Subjects, is nothing

elſe,

elſe, but want of power to do otherwiſe. He would be a much greater Prince, more beloved and reverenced, who could do all this himſelf; but no Prince can be preſent in all parts of his Kingdom, nor know every particular Subject, much leſs their particular caſes, and conditions, deſerts and merits; and therefore is forc't to divide this care into many hands, and in ſo doing ſhares his power and honour with his Subjects. But whoever imagines any ſuch thing of God, denies his omnipreſence, his omnipotence, his omniſcience, and his particular care and providence over his Creatures. God indeed does not always govern the world by an immediate power, but makes uſe both of the Miniſtry of Angels & Men; but he governs all things by his immediate direction, or at leaſt by his immediate inſpection. He overlooks every thing himſelf, while all Creatures either obey his commands, or ſubmit to his power. If this be the true notion of Gods governing the world, that he has the concernments of the whole Creation under his eye, and keeps the diſpoſal of all things in his own hands, ſo that nothing can be done, but either by his order or permiſſion; then the moſt perfect and glorious Angels, the greateſt Miniſters of the Divine Providence, can challenge no ſhare in Religious Worſhip, cannot be the objects of our truſt or hope, becauſe they are only Miniſters of the Divine Will, can do nothing from themſelves, as civil Miniſters of State, and Officers of great truſt can in Temporal Kingdoms, but are always under the eye, and always move at the command of God. In ſuch a ſtate of things all the peculiar rights of Soveraign Power and Dominion God reſerves wholly to himſelf, as any wiſe Prince would, among which the receiving the Prayers and Petitions of his Creatures is none of the leaſt; to hear Prayers is made the peculiar attribute of God in Scripture, *Thou art a God that heareſt prayers, therefore unto*

thee

thee shall all flesh come. And reason tells us, that it is the most eminent part of Soveraignty and Majesty; and the reason why Temporal Princes do not reserve this wholly to themselves, is because they cannot do it; but God can, and he challenges it to himself, and will not allow any Creature to do it; and there is no temptation to pray to any Creature, when we know, that they cannot help us, that they must receive their orders and commands from God, and not act by their own will and inclinations.

Thus Princes have their Favourites to whom they express a very partial fondness and respect, to whom they will deny nothing that they ask, nor hardly shew any grace or favour to their Subjects without them; and this forces Subjects to address themselves to their Prince by them; but it is a reproach to the Divine Goodness and universal Providence, to conceive any such thing of God; which yet is the foundation of the worship of Patron Saints and Angels, as persons so dear to God, that he cannot deny their requests, and will not grant our Petitions without them, or at least, that it is the most certain and effectual way to obtain what we desire, to offer up our Prayers and Petitions to God by their hands.

No doubt but all good men on earth, much more Blessed Saints and Angels in Heaven, as being more perfect and excellent Creatures, are very dear to God; but yet God is not fond and partial in his kindness, as earthly Princes are, but has an equal regard to all his Creatures, and delights in doing good to them and needs not to be importuned by any powerful Favourites to hear their cryes and prayers; he will as soon attend to the Prayers of an humble penitent sinner, as of the most glorious Saint, and is more ready to grant than they are to ask.

A Mediator of Redemption is very conſiſtent with all the perfections of the Divine Nature, and does mightily recommend both the goodneſs and wiſdom of God to the world. When Mankind had tranſgreſſed the Laws of their Creation, they forfeited their natural right and intereſt in the care and goodneſs of their Maker; The Divine Juſtice, and the wiſdom of God in the government of the world, required an atonement and expiation for ſin; and it was an amazing demonſtration of the Divine goodneſs to ſinners, that he found one himſelf that he gave his Son to be a propitiation for our ſins. When men by ſin had forfeited their original innocence and happineſs together, they could expect nothing from God, but by way of Covenant and promiſe; and every Covenant between contending parties, muſt be tranſacted in the hands of a Mediator, and none ſo fit to be our Mediator, as he who is our ranſome too.

And a Mediator muſt be inveſted with power and authority to ſee the terms of this Covenant performed, and this is his Mediatory Interceſſion. He intercedes not meerly as a powerful Favourite, but as the Author and Surety of the Covenant; not meerly by intreaties and prayers, but in vertue of his blood, which ſealed the Covenant, and made atonement and expiation for ſin.

Thus Chriſt is our Mediator of redemption, who hath redeemed us by his blood; and we muſt offer up all our Prayers to God in his name and powerful interceſſion, becauſe we can expect no bleſſings from God, but by vertue of that Covenant, which he purchaſt and ſealed with his Blood.

But now a Mediator of pure interceſſion, without regard to any atonement made for ſin, or any Covenant of redemption (ſuch as Saints and Angels and the bleſſed Virgin are made by the Church of *Rome*) is a mighty re-

reproach to the Divine Nature and perfections. It cloaths God with the paſſions and infirmities of earthly Princes; repreſents him as extreamly fond of ſome of his Creatures, and very regardleſs of others; as if his kindneſs to ſome favourite Saint, were a more powerful motive to him to do good, than his own love to goodneſs; as if he knew not when, nor to whom, to ſhew mercy without their direction or counſel, or would not do it without their importunity; as if ſome of his Creatures had as much the aſcendant over him, as ſome favourites have over their Princes, who can with a words ſpeaking have any thing of them, and extort favours from them, even againſt their wills and inclinations. No man can think there is any need of ſuch Interceſſors and Mediators with God, who believes him to be infinitely wiſe, and to be infinitely good; to know when it is fit to hear and to anſwer, and to be always ready to do, what his own wiſdom judges fit to be done. There can be no place for ſuch interceſſions and intreaties, to an infinitely perfect Being; for they always ſuppoſe ſome great weakneſs or defect in him who wants them, for even a wiſe and a good man wants no Mediators to perſwade him to do that good, which is fit to be done. The Objection againſt this is very obvious, and the Anſwer, I think, is as eaſie. The Objection is this: If God be ſo good, that he needs not ſuch Prayers and Interceſſions to move him to do good, Why do we pray for our ſelves? Why do we pray for one another? Why do we deſire the Prayers of good men here on earth? Why is it a greater reproach to the Divine Perfections to beg the Prayers of St. *Paul*, or St. *Peter*, now they are in Heaven, than to have begged their Prayers, while they had been on Earth?

To this I Anſwer: When we pray for our ſelves, I ſuppoſe, we do not pray as Mediators, but as Supplicants,

cants, and nothing can be more reasonable, than that those, who want mercy, or any other blessing should ask for it. It is certainly no reproach to the Divine goodness, that God makes Prayer the condition of our receiving, which is a very easie condition, and very necessary to maintain a constant sense and reverence of God, and a constant dependance on him. And when we pray for one another on earth, we are as meer supplicants, as when we pray for our selves; and to pray as supplicants is a very different thing from praying as Advocates, as Mediators, as Patrons. The vertue of the first consists only in the power and efficacy of Prayer; the second in the favour and interest of the person. This the Church of *Rome* her self owns, when she allows no Mediators and Advocates, but Saints in Heaven, which is a sign, she makes a vast difference between the prayers of Saints on earth, and Saints in Heaven.

There are great and wise reasons, why God should command and encourage our mutual prayers for each other while we are on earth; for this is the noblest exercise of universal love and charity, which is a necessary qualification to render our prayers acceptable to God; this preserves the unity of the body of Christ, which requires a sympathy and fellow-feeling of each others sufferings, this is the foundation of publick worship when we meet together to pray with, and for each other to our common Father; and it gives a great reputation to vertue and Religion in this world, when God hears the prayers of good men for the wicked, and removes or diverts those judgements which they were afraid of; this becomes the wisdom of God, and is no blemish to his goodness, to dispence his mercies and favours in such a manner as may best serve the great ends of Religion in this world.

God does not command us to pray for our selves or

others, becauſe he wants our importunities and ſolicitations to do good, but becauſe it ſerves the publick ends of Religion and Government, and is that natural homage and worſhip, which Creatures owe to their great Creator and Benefactor, and Soveraign Lord. But to imagine, that God needs Advocates and Mediators to ſolicite our cauſe for us in the Court of Heaven, where none of theſe ends can be ſerved by it, this is a plain impeachment of his wiſdom and goodneſs, as if he wanted great importunities to do good, and were more moved by a partial kindneſs and reſpect to ſome powerful favourites, than by the care of his Creatures, or his love to goodneſs.

From hence it evidently appears, how inconſequent that reaſoning is, from our begging the prayers of good men on earth, to prove the lawfulneſs of our praying to the Saints in Heaven to pray and interceed for us; the firſt makes them our fellow ſupplicants, the ſecond makes them our Mediators and Intercеſſors; and how little the Church of *Rome* gains by that diſtinction, between a Mediator of Redemption, and Mediators of pure Interceſſion; for though they pray to Saints and Angels only as Mediators of Interceſſion, yet this is a real reproach to the nature and government of God; a Mediator of Redemption is very conſiſtent with the Divine glory and perfections, a Mediator of pure interceſſion is not. And the ſum of all is this, That it is ſo far from advancing the Divine glory to worſhip Saints and Angels together with God, that it is a real reproach and diſhonour to him; and therefore this can be no Law nor Inſtitution of our Saviour, who came not to abrogate the Divine Laws, but to fulfil and perfect them. Some think there is no danger of diſhonouring God by that honour they give to Saints and Angels, becauſe they honour them as Gods Friends and Favourites, as thoſe whom

whom God has honoured and advanced to great glory; and therefore whatever honour they do to them, rebounds back again on God, and this may be true, while we give no honour to Saints and Angels, but what is consistent with the Divine glory; but when the very nature of that honour and worship we pay to them, is a diminution of Gods glory, and a reproach to his infinite perfections, as I have made it appear, the worship of Saints and Angels is, surely it cannot be for Gods glory to advance his Creatures by lessening himself.

SECT. VII.

2. LEt us now consider, whether the worship of Saints and Angels together with God, be a more perfect state of Religion than the worship of God alone, with respect to our selves; whether it puts us into a more perfect and excellent state. It does indeed mightily gratifie the superstition of mankind to have a multitude of Advocates and Mediators to address to, but there are three considerations which may satisfie any man, how far this is from a perfect state of Religion.

1. That it argues very mean and low conceits of God, for did men believe God to be so wise, so good, and so powerful, as really he is, they would be contented with one infinite God, instead of ten thousand meaner Advocates. The worship of Saints and Angels, as I have already proved, is a great reproach to the Divine perfections, and therefore such worshippers must have very imperfect and childish apprehensions of the Supreme Being, which is a plain proof what an imperfect state of Religion this is; for the perfection of Religion is always proportioned to that knowledge we have of God, who is the object of it.

2. This worship of Saints and Angels is a very ser-

vile state, it subjects us to our fellow-creatures, who are by nature but our equals, however are not our Gods. It is a state of liberty, freedom and honour, to be subject to God, who is our natural Lord and Soveraign, but to fall down to our fellow Creatures, and to worship them with Divine honours, with all humility of address, and sacred and awful regards, is to debase ourselves as much below the dignity of our natures, as we advance them above it. The excellency and perfection of reasonable Creatures principally consists in their Religion, and that is the most perfect Religion, which does most advance, adorn, and perfect our Natures; but it is an argument of an abject mind, to be contented to worship the most excellent Creatures, which is a greater dishonour than to own the vilest Slave for our Prince. Mean objects of worship do more debase the Soul, than any other the vilest submissions; and the more our dependancies are, and the meaner they are, the more imperfect our State and Religion is.

3. The greatest perfection of Religion, consists in the nearest and most immediate approach to God; which I think, these men cannot pretend to, who flye to the patronage and intercession of Saints and Angels, to obtain their Petitions of him. Though we should allow it lawful to pray to Saints and Angels to mediate for us with God, yet we cannot but own it a more perfect state to do as the Saints and Angels themselves do, go to God without any other Advocate but Christ himself. It is a great happiness to have a friend at Court, to commend us to our Prince, when we have no interest of our own, but it is a greater priviledge to go immediately to our Prince, when we please, without any Favourite to introduce us. This is the perfect state of the Gospel, that we have received *The adoption of sons, and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son* 4 Gal. 5, 6.

into

into our hearts, crying Abba Father. That is, this Holy Spirit which dwells in us, teaches us to call God Father, and to pray to him with the humble assurance and confidence of Children. This is the effect of Christ intercession for us, *That we may now come boldly unto the throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in a time of need.* The throne of Grace certainly is not the shrine of any Saints, but the immediate throne and presence of God, whether we may immediately direct our Prayers through the merits and intercession of Christ. Upon the same account the whole body of Christians are called *a Spiritual house*, that is, the Temple of God, where he is peculiarly present to hear those Prayers which are made to him. *An holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.* And *a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.* This is a privilege above what the Jews enjoyed, they had a Priesthood to minister in holy things, and to offer their Sacrifices for them, but the whole Nation was not a Priesthood, nor had such immediate access to God; but now every Christian has as near an access to God as the Priests themselves under the Law had; can offer up his Prayers and Spiritual Sacrifices immediately to God; and that very acceptably too, through Jesus Christ our great High Priest and Mediator; and if our Prayers be acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, we need no other Mediators or Advocates. This is the onely direction our Saviour gave his Disciples a little before his death, to ask in his name, with this promise, *If ye ask any thing in my name, I will do it. Hitherto have you asked nothing in my name, ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.* And to give them the greater assurance of acceptance, he acquaints them with Gods great and tender affection for them, such as a Father has for his Children. *At that day ye shall ask in my name;*

4 Hebr. 16.

1 Pet. 2 5, 9.

14 Joh. 13, 15. 16 Joh. 24.

26, 27. *name; and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you because ye have loved me, and have believed, that I came out from God*; a reason which equally extends to all those who shall believe in Christ, to the end of the world. And can we now imagine, that when our Saviour has purchaft for us this liberty of access to God, he should send us round about by the shrines and Altars of numerous and unknown Saints to the Throne of Grace. When he will not assert the necessity of his own Prayers for us, while we pray in his name, because our heavenly Father hath such a tender affection for all the Disciples of Christ, can we think it necessary to pray to St. *Paul* and St. *Peter*, and the Virgin *Mary* to pray for us. This is none of our Saviours institution, nor can it be, because Christ by his death and sufferings and intercessions brings us nearer to

10 Hebr. 19, 20, 21, 22. God, as the Apostle to the *Hebrews* speaks, *Having therefore Brethren boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, and having an high Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of Faith.* But the worship of Saints and Angels removes us at a great distance from God, as not daring to approach his presence without the mediation of some Favourite Saint. And though the Church of *Rome* does sometimes pray directly to God only, in the Name and Mediation of Christ, as the Pagans themselves sometimes did to their Supreme Deity, yet it seems this is what they dare not trust to, and therefore joyn the Meditation of Saints with their Prayers to God, and never pray to God without it.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

5. THat the Gospel of our Saviour has made no alteration in the object of our worship, appears from that Analogie which there is, and ought to be, between the Jewish and Christian Worship. The Jewish and Christian Church are but one Church, and their worship the same worship, only with this difference, that the Jewish worship was in Type and Figure, and Ceremony, the Christian worship in Truth and Substance. And therefore if this legal and Evangelical worship be the same it must have the some object, for the object is the most essential part of worship.

So that if it appear, not only from the expres letter of the Law of *Moses*, but from all the Types and Figures of the Law, that God only was to be worshipt by the Jewish Church; if Christ was to fulfil all these Types and Figures in his own person, and in the Evangelical worship, then it is certain, that the object of our worship must be the same still; for if the Type was confined in its nature and signification to the worship of One God, then the whole Christian worship, which was signifyed and præfigured by these Types, must be peculiar and appropriate to the same One Supreme God.

As for instance. I have already proved at large, that the Jews were to worship but One God, because they had but one Temple to worship in, and all their worship had some relation or other to this one Temple, and therefore all their worship was appropriated to that One God, whose Temple it was; now we know Gods dwelling in the Temple at *Jerusalem*, was only a Type and Figure of Gods dwelling in Humane Nature, upon which account Christ calls his body the Temple; and St. *John* tells us, *That the word was made flesh and dwelt among* 2 Joh. 19. 21. 1 Joh. 14.

among us, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, tabernacled among us; as God formerly dwelt in the Jewish Tabernacle or Temple, and St. *Paul* adds, *That the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily*, σωματικῶς, really, substantially, as an accomplishment of Gods dwelling by Types and Figures, and shadows in the Jewish Temple.

2 Coloss. 3.

Now if all the Jewish worship was confined to the Temple, or had a necessary relation to it, as I have already proved, and this Temple was but a figure of the Incarnation of Christ, who should dwell among us in humane nature, then all the Christian worship must be offered up to God through Jesus Christ, as all the Jewish worship was offered to God at the Temple; for Christ is the only Temple (in a strict and proper sense) of the Christian Church, and therefore he alone can render all our services acceptable to God. So that God, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the only object of our worship, and Christ considered as God Incarnate, as God dwelling in humane nature, is the only Temple where all our worship must be offered to God, that is, we shall find acceptance with God only in his name and mediation; we must worship no other Being but only the Supreme God, and that only through Jesus Christ.

Thus under the Law the Priests were to intercede for the people, but not without Sacrifice; their Intercession was founded in making atonement and expiation for sin; which plainly signified, that under the Gospel we can have no other Mediator, but only him, who expiates our sins, and intercedes in the merits of his Sacrifice; who is our Priest and our Sacrifice, and therefore our Mediator; as St. *John* observes. *If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous and he is the propitiation for our sins.* The Law knew no such thing as a Mediator of pure intercession, a Mediator,

1 Joh. 2. 1,2.

who

who is no Priest, and offers no Sacrifice for us, and therefore the Gospel allows of no such Mediators neither, who mediate only by their Prayers, without a Sacrifice, such Mediators as the Church of *Rome* makes of Saints and Angels and the Virgin *Mary*; but we have only one Mediator, a Mediator of redemption, who has purchased us with his Blood, of whom the Priests under the Law were Types and Figures.

Thus under the Law, none but the High Priest was to enter into the Holy of Holies, with the blood of the Sacrifice; now the Holy of Holies was a Type of Heaven, and therefore this plainly signified, that under the Gospel, there should be but one High Priest and Mediator, to offer up our Prayers and Supplications in Heaven. He and he only, who enters into Heaven with his own Blood, as the High Priest went into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the Sacrifice. There may be a great many Priests and Advocates on Earth to intercede for us, as there were under the Law, great numbers of Priests, the Sons of *Aaron*, to attend the Service and Ministry of the Temple, but we have, and can have, but one Priest and Mediator in Heaven. 1. Heb. 12.

Whoever acknowledges that the Priesthood and Ministry of the Law was Typical of the Evangelical Priesthood and Worship, cannot avoid the force of this Argument, and whoever will not acknowledge this, must reject most of St. *Paul's* Epistles, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, which proceeds wholely upon this way of reasoning. Now this manifestly justifies the worship of the Church of *England*, as true Christian worship, for we worship One God through one Mediator, who offered himself a Sacrifice for us, when he was on Earth, and intercedes for us as our High Priest in Heaven, which answers to the One Temple, and the One High Priest under the Law: But though the Church of *Rome* does

what we do, worship the Supreme God through Jesus Christ, yet she spoils the Analogie between the Type and the Antitype, the legal and Evangelical worship, by doing more: when she sends us to the Shrines and Altars of so many several Saints, surely this cannot answer to that one Temple at *Jerusalem*, where God alone was to be worshipped, there are as many Temples and Mercy-seats now, as there are Shrines and Altars of Saints and Angels, by whose Intercession we may obtain our requests of God. When she advances Saints and Angels to the Office of Mediators and Intercessors in Heaven, this contradicts the Type of One High Priest, who alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, which was a type of Heaven; for there is some difference between having one Mediator in Heaven, (and there can be no more under the Gospel to answer to the Typical High Priest under the Law) and having a hundred Mediators in Heaven together with our Typical High Priest. To have a Mediator of pure Intercession in Heaven, who never offered any Sacrifice for us, cannot answer to the High Priest under the Law, who could not enter into the Holy of Holies without the blood of the Sacrifice. The High Priests entring but once a year into the Holy of Holies, which was typical of Christs entring once into Heaven to intercede for us, cannot be reconciled with a new succession of Mediators, as often as the Pope of *Rome* pleases to canonize them. So that either the Law was not typical of the state of the Gospel, or the Worship of Saints and Angels, which is so contrary to all the types and figures of the Law, cannot be true Christian Worship.

Sixthly, I shall add but one thing more, that Christ and his Apostles have made no alteration in the object of worship, appears from hence, that *de facto* there is no such Law in the Gospel for the worship of any other Being

ing

ing besides the One Supreme God. There is a great deal against it, as I have already shewn; but if there had been nothing against it, it had been argument enough against any such alteration, that there is no expreſs positive Law for it. The force of which argument does not conſiſt meerly in the ſilence of the Goſpel, that there is nothing ſaid for it, (which the moſt Learned Advocates of the Church of *Rome* readily grant, and give their reaſons, ſuch as they are, why this was not done, why we are not directed to pray to Saints and Angels, and Images, &c.) but the argument lies in this, that there can be no alteration made in the object of worſhip without an expreſs Law; and therefore there is no alteration made, becauſe there is no ſuch Law in the Goſpel.

The Jews were expreſly commanded to worſhip no other Being, but the Lord *Jehovah*, as I have already proved, which Law appropriates all the acts of Religious Worſhip to one God; and therefore all thoſe, who were under the obligation of this Law (as to be ſure all natural Jews were) could not without the guilt of Idolatry give any Religious Worſhip to any other Being, till this Law were expreſly repealed, and expreſs leave given to worſhip ſome other Divine Beings beſides the Supreme God; ſo that at leaſt our Saviour himſelf, while he was on Earth, and ſubject to the Law, and his Apoſtles, and all believing Jews, were obliged by this Law to worſhip none but God, unleſs we can ſhew where Chriſt by his Legiſlative Authority, or his Apoſtles by Commiſſion from him, have expreſly repealed this Law; nay, indeed, unleſs we can ſhew, that Chriſt himſelf repealed this Law, and taught the worſhip of Saints and Angels, the Apoſtles themſelves could have no authority to do it. For their Commiſſion was only to teach what Chriſt had commanded them, which though it does not extend 28. Mat. 20.

to matters of order and discipline, and the external circumstances of worship, yet it does to all the essentials of Faith and Worship, and I think the right object of Worship is the most essential thing in Religious Worship.

From hence it appears, that at least all the Jewish Christians in the Apostles days, and all succeeding Ages to this day, cannot Worship Saints and Angels without Idolatry, because the Law, which was given to them, and never yet repealed, commands them to worship none but God; and if Gentile Converts were received into the Jewish Christian Church (and Christ has but one Church of Jews and Gentiles) they must also be obliged by all those Laws, which were then, and are still obligatory to all believing Jews, and therefore Gentile as well as Jewish Christians, are still bound to worship none but God.

Now I think I need not prove, that an express Law can be repealed onely by an express Law. That Law which commands us to worship God, and him onely, must continue in full force, till God do as expressly declare, that he allows us to pay some degree of Religious Worship to other Beings besides himself: When a Law-giver has declared his will and pleasure by a Law, it is not fit that Subjects should be allowed to guess at his mind, and dispute away an express Law by some surmizes and consequences, how probable soever they may appear; for at this rate a Law signifies nothing, if we may guess at the will of our Law-giver, without and against an express Law. And yet none of the Advocates of the Church of *Rome* (though they are not usually guilty of too much modesty) ever had the confidence to pretend an express Law for the worship of Saints and Angels, and Images, &c. and though they sometimes alledge Scripture to prove this by, yet they do not pretend that they are direct proofs, but onely attempt to prove some

other Doctrines from Scripture, from which they think they may prove by some probable consequences that which the Scripture no where plainly teaches, nay the contrary to which is expresly taught in Scripture. And if this may be allow'd, I know no Law of God so plain and expres, but a witty man may find ways to escape the obligation of it. This is a consideration of great moment, and therefore I shall discourse more particularly of it.

The Law of *Moses* expresly commands us to worship God, and him onely; Our Saviour Christ owns and confirms the authority of this Law in the Gospel; the Church of *Rome* notwithstanding this Law, gives Religious Worship to Creatures; the question then is, how she avoids the force of this Law, since it is no where expresly repealed, and she does not pretend that it is. Now the Patrons of Creature-worship think to justifie themselves from the breach of this Law, these three ways. 1. By consequences drawn, as they pretend, from other Scripture-Doctrines. 2. By distinctions. And 3. By authority.* Let us then examine, whether all this have any force against an expres Law, which was never expresly repealed.

1. By consequences drawn, as they pretend, from other Scripture-Doctrines, and I shall discourse this with a particular reference to the Invocation of Saints. For when they would prove the lawfulnes of praying to Saints, they alledge no direct proof of this from Scripture, but because they must make a shew of saying something from Scripture, when they are to deal with such Hereticks as will be satisfied with no less authority, they endeavour to prove something else from Scripture, from whence they think by an easie consequence, they can prove the lawfulnes of praying to Saints. Thus

Thus they very easily prove, that we may and ought to pray for one another, and to desire each others prayers while we are on Earth: and from hence they presently conclude, that we may as lawfully pray to Saints in Heaven to pray for us, as beg and desire their prayers, while they are on Earth.

And to confirm this, they endeavour to prove, that some extraordinary Saints, whose merits are very great, do directly ascend up into Heaven into the immediate presence of God, and a participation of his Glory; and hence they conclude, that they have authority and power to help us and to intercede for us, and that they are so far advanced above us in this mortal state, that they deserve some kind of Religious Honour and Worship from us, as being *Dii per participationem*, Gods by participation, that is, by partaking in the Divine Nature and Glory by their advancement to Heaven.

And if after all this they can prove, that the Saints in Heaven do pray and intercede for us on Earth, they think the demonstration is compleat and perfect, that therefore * *It is good and profitable* (as the Council of *Trent* words it) *humbly to invocate the Saints, after the manner of Supplication, and to fly to their prayers and help and aid to obtain blessings of God by his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only* (not Intercessor and Advocate, but) *Redeemer and Saviour.*

* Bonum atque utile esse suppliciter Sanctos invocare, & ab beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Domini nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor & Salvator est, ad eorum orationes opem auxiliumque confugere. Conc. Trin. 16. 25. *de Invocat.*

Now how they prove all this, is not my business at present to enquire; but my inquiry is, whether such arguments as these be sufficient to oppose against the authority of an express Law; and if they be, truly I think it a very vain thing, either for God or men to make any Laws. For,

1. I desire to know, what these Gentlemen would

prove

prove by ſuch kind of arguments as theſe. Suppoſe we ſhould grant them, that the Saints are received into Heaven before the Reſurrection, and are actually poſſeſt of all that Glory and Happineſs, which they ſay they are; ſuppoſe we ſhould grant them, that by ſome means unknown to us, Saints and Angels are acquainted with all that we do and ſuffer in this world, hear all our vocal or mental prayers, which we offer to God or to themſelves, and that they do actually pray and intercede for us, what follows from hence? That therefore we may pray to Saints? not I hope if there be an expreſs Law againſt it. Theſe arguments at moſt can onely prove, that in the nature of the thing it might be fitting and reaſonable to pray to Saints, if God thought fit to allow it, not that we muſt pray to Saints, though God has forbid it. For thoſe are powerful reaſons indeed, which can juſtifie Saint-worſhip againſt the expreſs Law and declared Will of God. Could they firſt prove one of theſe three things: Either 1. that there is no ſuch Law againſt the worſhip of any other Being beſides God. Or 2. that this is not the ſence of this Law, that they muſt not pray to Saints or Angels, that the Law, which forbids us to worſhip any Being but God, does not forbid the worſhip of Saints. Or 3. that though there was ſuch a Law, and this were the ſence of it, and this Law were never formally repealed by God, yet it diſappears of it ſelf and obliges no longer ſince the diſcovery of ſuch reaſons as theſe for the worſhip of Saints and Angels. I ſay, could they prove any thing of this in the firſt place, then there would be as much reaſon for the worſhip of Saints, as there is ſtrength and validity in their Arguments: but no Reaſon can take place againſt an expreſs Law, till it be as expreſly repealed. For,

2. If an expreſs Law may be diſobeyed, as often as men fancy they ſee reaſon to do, what the Law forbids,

this

this overthrows the whole authority of making Laws, and makes every Subject a Judge, whether the Laws of a Soveraign Prince shall be obeyed or not. At this rate he has the greatest authority, who has the best reason; and since every man believes his own reason to be best, every man is the Soveraign Lord of his own actions. It is to be presumed, that no Prince makes a Law, but what he apprehends some reason for, and to oppose any mans private reason against a Law, is to set up a private mans reason against the publick reason of government: and yet it is much worse to oppose our reason against a Divine Law, which is to oppose the reason of Creatures against the reason of God, unless we will say, that God makes Laws without reason, and those who can believe that, may as easily imagine, that God will expect, that those Laws which he makes without reason, should be obeyed without reason also, and then to be sure all their reasons cannot repeal a Law, nor justifie them in the breach of it. It becomes every Creature to believe the will of God to be the highest reason, and therefore when God has declared his will by an express Law, while this Law continues in force, (as it must do, till it be as expresly repealed) it is an impudent thing to urge our reasons against the obligations of it. So that since God has expresly forbid us to worship any Being besides himself, unless we can prove, that God has repealed this Law, it will never justifie the worship of Saints and Angels, though we could by the plainest and easiest arguments prove to the conviction of all Mankind, that Saints and Angels are very fit objects of our Religious Worship, and that it is no diminution to the glory of God to pay some degree of Religious worship to them.

3. Especially, when the matter of the Law is such, that whatever reasons may be pretended on one side or the other, it must still be acknowledged to be wholly at the

the will and pleaſure of the Law-giver, which ſide he will chooſe. As for inſtance, ſuppoſe there were no natural and neceſſary reaſon againſt the worſhip of Saints and Angels, yet there is no natural and neceſſary reaſon for it neither, and therefore God may either allow or forbid it, as he himſelf pleaſes, without aſſigning any reaſon why he does either. And when it appears that God might forbid it if he pleaſes, and that he has actually forbid it by an expreſs Law, it is time to leave off reaſoning about it: natural reaſon can give us no aſſurance of any thing, which it cannot prove to be neceſſary, whatever in the nature and reaſon of things may be, or may not be, can never be proved either to be, or not to be, by meer reaſon; for it is a contradiction to ſay, that there is no neceſſary reaſon why ſuch a thing ſhould be, and yet that I can prove by reaſon, that it muſt be, which ſuppoſes, that there is a neceſſary reaſon, why it ſhould be; for I cannot prove, that it muſt be, unleſs I can prove, that it muſt neceſſarily be; that is, that there is a neceſſary reaſon, why it ſhould be.

To apply this then to our preſent Caſe. The Law expreſly forbids us to worſhip any other Being beſides the Supreme God, the Church of *Rome* prays to Saints and Angels and Images, which is an eſſential part of Divine Worſhip; and without ever attempting to prove this Law to be repealed, ſhe juſtifies her worſhip by ſuch reaſons and conſequences, as I have now cited from their moſt celebrated Doctors, and ſome of which are the principles, whereon the Council of *Trent* founds their praying to Saints and Angels. I ask then, whether theſe arguments, whereby they endeavour to juſtifie the worſhip of Saints and Angels, prove that we muſt worſhip them, that ſuch worſhip is their natural right, and our duty. No, this the Church of *Rome* will not own; the moſt the Council of *Trent* ſays, is, that it is *bonum & utile*, good

and profitable to do it; but, say I, if they do not prove it to be necessary, they prove nothing; for if Saints and Angels have not a natural right to our worship, though we should suppose them to be very fit objects of some degrees of worship, yet it is at Gods choice, whether he will allow it or not, and they can challenge no worship, and we must give none, if God forbids it; and therefore since God has forbid the worship of any Being, but himself (and therefore of the most excellent Saints and Angels) by an express Law; and it no-where appears, where or when, or in what manner this Law was repealed, a hundred such arguments as these cannot prove it lawful to worship Saints and Angels against an express Law not to do it. Though we should grant that God, if he pleased, might allow us to worship Saints and Angels, as the Church of *Rome* does, without any deminution of his own Glory, which is the most that all their arguments can pretend to prove, yet it does not hence follow, that we may worship them, when God by an express Law has declared, that he will not allow it. No arguments nor consequences can prove, that God allows us to do that, which by an express Law he has forbid us to do. No reason can prove that to be Gods will, which he has publickly declared in his Law to be against his will.

4. That no reason or arguments can absolve us from our obedience to an express Law, till it be as expresly repealed, appears from this, that our obligation to obedience does not depend meerly upon the reason of the Law, but upon the authority of the Law-giver, and therefore though the reason of the Law should cease, yet while it is inforced by the same authority, it obliges still. Thus I am sure, it is in humane Laws, and it is very fitting it should be so; meer reason cannot make a Law, for then every thing which is reasonable, would be a ne-

cessary

ceſſary duty; that which is reaſonable may be fit matter for a Law, but it is the authority of the Law-giver which makes the Law, and the ſame authority which at firſt made it a Law, continues it to be a Law while the authority laſts, though the particular reaſon for which it was enacted into a Law, may ceaſe.

So that though the Church of *Rome* could prove, that there is no reaſon now againſt the worſhip of Saints and Angels, that all thoſe reaſons for which God forbad the Jews to worſhip any one but himſelf, were now ceaſed; yet till the Law be repealed too, it is utterly unlawful to worſhip any Being beſides the Supreme God, and yet this is the moſt that all their reaſonings come to, that there is not the ſame reaſon for this Law under the State of the Goſpel, that there was under the Jewiſh Oeconomy.

They ſuppoſe, that God forbad the Jews to worſhip any one but himſelf, becauſe they were in great danger of falling into Pagan Idolatries, and worſhipping the Gods of the *Ægyptians*, and other Neighbour-Nations, and that this was the caſe alſo of the Chriſtian Church at the firſt planting of the Goſpel; but now there is no danger of worſhipping falſe Gods, we may very ſecurely worſhip the Friends and Favourites of God.

They ſuppoſe, that all the ancient Patriarchs who lived before the Reſurrection of Chriſt, were not received into Heaven, and therefore not being in a ſtate of Bliſs and Glory themſelves, were not yet capable of Divine Honours, could neither know our Prayers, nor intercede for us. But now at laſt ſome eminent Saints and Martyrs aſcend directly into Heaven, and are the *beati*, advanced to ſuch a ſtate of Happineſs and Glory, that they are fit objects of Religious Worſhip, and are ſo powerful in the Court of Heaven, that God denies them nothing which they ask; and ſo tender and compaſſionate

to us, that they readily undertake our Cauſe, and intercede for us, and therefore it is very good and profitable now to invoke their aid and aſſiſtance by ſolemn and devout Prayers.

Now though the learnedſt men among them are put to miſerable ſhifts to prove the leaſt part of all this, yet let us for argument-ſake, ſuppoſe all this to be true, that things are mightily changed ſince the making of this Law, and that there is not the ſame reaſon now to confine all Religious Worſhip to God alone, that there was in the time of *Moſes*, what follows from hence, that therefore we may now worſhip Saints and Angels, notwithſtanding this Law which forbids it? by no means, unleſs they can prove that the Law is repealed too, as well as the reaſon ceaſed: Here is the authority of the Law-giver ſtill, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that we had loſt the reaſon of the Law; till the Law is as expreſly repealed as it was given, it is Gods Will ſtill, and that is reaſon enough to bind the Law upon us, though other reaſons fail. The reaſon (if we ſpeak of ſuch reaſons as theſe, which the Church of *Rome* aſſigns, for it is a different caſe, if we ſpeak of eternal and neceſſary reaſon, which is nothing elſe but the eternal & immutable nature and will of God, which is an eternal Law) did not make the Law, and the change of the reaſon cannot repeal it. And ſince we ſee, that God has not repealed this Law, we rather ought to conclude, that we are miſtaken in the reaſons, for which God made this Law, or that there are other reaſons, which we know not of, for which he continues it: we may indeed reaſonably ſuppoſe, that God will repeal a Law, when the reaſon, for which it was given, ceaſes, though earthly Princes may not always do ſo; but ſtill the Law binds till it be repealed; and it is more reaſonable to conclude, that the reaſon of the Law continues, while we ſee God does not repeal it,

than

than firſt to perſwade our ſelves, that the reaſon of the Law is changed, and thence infer the repeal and abrogation of the Law, when we ſee no ſuch thing done.

5. That theſe arguments which the Roman Doctors urge, to juſtifie their worſhip of Saints and Angels, are of no force to repeal that Law, which forbids the worſhip of any other Being beſides the Supreme God, appears from this, that they had no force in them to prevent the making of this Law, and therefore much leſs can they repeal it now it is made: The reaſons which they uſe, had the ſame force then, which they have now, and if notwithſtanding all theſe reaſons, God thought fit to forbid the worſhip of all Created Beings, it is ridiculous to imagine, that theſe reaſons ſhould ſuperſede the obligation of that Law, which is made in contradiction to all ſuch reaſonings: as to ſhew this briefly.

They prove, that we may pray to Saints and Angels to pray for us, becauſe we may deſire good men on earth to pray for us. Now ſuppoſe we could not aſſign the difference between praying to Saints in Heaven, and deſiring the prayers of Saints on earth, yet I would deſire to know, whether good men did not pray for one another, and deſire each others prayers, before and after God gave this Law on Mount *Sinai*, which forbids the Religious worſhip and invocation of any other Being but himſelf: if good men did in all ages pray for one another, and deſire one anothers prayers, and God allowed and approved of this, then it ſeems God did not think this a good reaſon for praying to Saints and Angels in Heaven, becauſe good men might beg each others prayers on earth, for if he had, he would not have made that Law, which forbids ſuch a Religious Invocation of any Creature. And if notwithſtanding this reaſon, which had as much force then, as it has now, God made and promulged this Law, this reaſon can never repeal it, nor diſſolve the obligation of it.

Thus

Thus if the Saints & Angels being in Heaven be a good reaſon why they ſhould be worſhipped, this was as good a reaſon at the giving of the Law, as it is now; for tho we ſhould ſuppoſe with the Church of *Rome*, that Saints departed were not in Heaven then, yet certainly the Angels were, and if their being in Heaven made them fit objects of our worſhip, why did God ſo expreſly forbid it; and if he forbad it then, when there was as much reaſon to allow the worſhip of thoſe heavenly Inhabitants, as there is now, this argument cannot prove, but that God forbids it ſtill.

The ſame may be ſaid of the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels. The Papiſts ſuppoſe, that the Saints and Angels pray and intercede for us in Heaven, and obtain for, and convey many bleſſings to us, and therefore it is good and profitable to pray to them, and to flie to their patronage; now though indeed they date the Interceſſion of Saints, (as they do their admiſſion into heaven) from the Reſurrection of our Saviour, yet there is as much evidence for the aids and interceſſions of Angels before and under the Law, as there is now; nay, I think ſomewhat more; for the government of the world was much more under the adminiſtration of Angels, in the time of the Law, then it is now; and yet notwithſtanding this, God did by an expreſs Law forbid the worſhip of any Being but himſelf, and therefore of theſe Angelical powers, who are ſomewhat ſuperiour to Saints in Heaven; and if this were no good reaſon againſt making this Law, it can be no good reaſon to prove the abrogation of it.

2. The next way they take to evade the obligation of this Law of worſhipping God only, is by diſtinctions. As to name the chief of them.

They tell us, that this Law is only oppoſed to the worſhip of falſe Gods, ſuch Gods as the Heathens worſhipped

ſhipped, not to the worſhip of Saints and Angels, who are the Friends and Favourites of God.

And then they diſtinguiſh about the nature of worſhip; they confeſs there is a worſhip which is peculiar to God, Supreme and Soveraign worſhip, which is peculiar to the Supreme Being, and this for what reaſon I know not, they call *Latria*; but then there is an inferiour degree of worſhip, which they call *Dulia*, which may be given to excellent Creatures, to Saints and Angels, who reign with Chriſt in Heaven.

They farther diſtinguiſh between abſolute and relative worſhip. Abſolute worſhip is, when we worſhip a Being for its ſelf, and thus God onely is to be worſhipped; but relative worſhip is, when we worſhip one Being out of reſpect to another, and thus we may worſhip Saints and Angels upon account of their relation to God.

Now I ſhall have occaſion to examine theſe diſtinctions more particularly hereafter, my buſineſs at preſent is to examine, how far theſe diſtinctions can juſtifie the worſhip of Saints and Angels againſt an expreſs Law, which commands us to worſhip God only. And I have three things to ſay on this argument. 1. That the letter of the Law will admit of no ſuch diſtinctions as theſe. 2. That the Scripture no where allows of any ſuch diſtinctions. And 3. That no diſtinctions can juſtifie our acting againſt the letter of a Law, which have not the ſame authority which the Law has.

1. The letter of the Law will admit of no ſuch diſtinctions as theſe. The Law is, *Thou ſhalt have none other Gods before me.* The explication of this Law is, *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, him ſhalt thou ſerve, and to him ſhalt thou cleave and ſwear by his name.* Or as our Saviour expounds it, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* 20 Exod. 10 Deut. 20. 4 Matth 10.

Now theſe words do plainly exclude the worſhip of all

all other Beings beſides the Supreme God: They exclude indeed the worſhip of all the Heathen Gods, which were at that time worſhipped in the world, but they are not confined to the worſhip of the Heathen Gods, nor meerly to the worſhip of thoſe Gods who were at that time worſhipt, but ſhould any new Gods ſtart up in after Ages, whether among Jews or Chriſtians, the words extend to all that are, and all that ever ſhall be worſhipped. *Thou ſhalt have none other Gods before Me*, Signifies, that we muſt worſhip no other Being but the Supreme God, for *to have a God*, is to give religious worſhip to ſome Being; as appears from that expoſition, which both *Moſes* and our Saviour Chriſt gives of it. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve.* For it is impoſſible to have any God beſides the Supreme God, in any other ſenſe than as we worſhip ſome other Being, beſides the Supreme God, with Divine honours; and whatever Being we ſo worſhip, become our God, and therefore this Law forbids the worſhip of any Being, which is not God, be it Saint or Angel, or the Virgin *Mary*; how excellent and perfect Creatures ſoever they be, they are not our God, and therefore muſt not be worſhipped. If we muſt worſhip and ſerve God *onely*, as our Saviour expreſly tells us, that we muſt worſhip no Creature whatever it be, the worſhip of Saints and Angels is as expreſly forbid by this Law, as the worſhip of the Heathen Gods, for that Law which commands us to worſhip God *onely*, excludes the worſhip of all Creatures, whatever they be.

But may not the meaning of this Law be onely this: That we muſt not give Supreme and Soveraign worſhip to any other Being, but the Supreme God, but we may give an inferiour degree of worſhip to ſome excellent Spirits, who under God have the care of us. And

is

is not this plainly ſignified in the very letter of the Law, when it ſays, *Thou ſhalt have none other Gods before me.* For no other worſhip makes any Being a God, but that which is Supreme and Soveraign, peculiar and appropriate to the One Supreme God; and therefore not to have any other Being for our God, is not to give Supreme and Soveraign worſhip to it. Now what that worſhip is, which is peculiar and appropriate to the Supreme God, I ſhall diſcourſe particularly in the ſecond part; our preſent inquiry is, whether this Law makes any ſuch diſtinction. The Laws ſays, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve:* Here is no diſtinction between Supreme and Subordinate worſhip; whatever is an Act of worſhip muſt be given to God onely. But the Law ſays, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods before me,* and therefore it muſt ſignifie Supreme & Soveraign worſhip, for no other degree of worſhip makes a God. Did the Heathens then worſhip no inferior gods? did thoſe who worſhip'ped ſo many ſeveral Gods, look upon them all as ſupreme and abſolute? or were they ſo ſenſeleſs as to give ſupreme and ſoveraign worſhip to inferior Deities? or does not this Law forbid the worſhip of thoſe Gods, whom the Heathens worſhipped as inferior Dæmons, but onely the worſhip of thoſe Gods, whom they accounted ſupreme and ſoveraign? If this Law forbids the worſhip of all Heathen Gods, and it is certain, that they worſhipped a great many Gods, whom they did not account ſupreme, then there can be no place for this diſtinction here, for ſuch an inferiour worſhip as makes an inferiour God, is as well forbid, as Supreme and Soveraign worſhip.

The Law ſays, *Thou ſhalt have none other Gods before me:* or beſides me; which as I obſerved before, does not exclude the worſhip of the Supreme God, but forbids the worſhip of any other Being together with

him. The meaning is not, Thou shalt not renounce my worship, for the worship of any other Gods, but thou shalt worship me, and no other God besides me: now I would onely ask this question, Whether a Jew who worshipped the God of *Israel*, who declared himself to be the Supreme God, could give Supreme worship to any other God? This is contrary to the sense of all mankind, to worship him as supreme, whom they do not believe to be supreme. And therefore when God forbad them to joyn the worship of any other Gods with the worship of himself, he must forbid all kinds and degrees of worship, even the most inferiour worship, which the Heathens paid to their inferiour Deities.

If you say, that God did indeed forbid all kinds and degrees of worship to be paid to the Heathen Gods, which were impure and wicked Spirits, but still it is lawful to pay an inferiour worship to Saints and Angels, who are the friends of God. I answer, the law makes no distinction between the worship of good and bad Spirits, and therefore as far as this Law is concerned, we must either deny this inferiour worship to all, or grant it to all. If this Law does not forbid giving inferiour degrees of worship to other Beings, then it does not forbid the inferiour worship of Heathen Gods; that may be faulty upon other accounts, but is no breach of this Law, and then the Heathens were not guilty of Idolatry in worshipping their inferiour Daemons with an inferiour worship. If this Law does forbid even this inferiour degree of worship, then it forbids the worship of good Spirits too, though with an inferiour worship, which transforms true Saints and Angels into false and fictitious Deities.

But I have another argument to prove, that this Law can have no respect to the different degrees of wor-

worſhip. The *Roman* Doctors themſelves grant, that the difference between ſupreme and ſubordinate or inferiour worſhip, does not conſiſt in the outward Act, that all or moſt of the external Acts of worſhip may belong to both kinds, they except indeed Sacrifice, but contrary to the ſenſe of all men; for the Heathens offered Sacrifice to their inferiour Deities, as well as to the ſupreme; and there is no imaginable reaſon to be aſſigned, why Sacrifice, as well as Prayer, may not be an act of inferiour, as well as of ſupreme worſhip. The difference then between ſupreme and inferiour worſhip, is onely in the intention and devotion of the worſhippers, and no man can by the external act know whether this be ſupreme or inferiour worſhip. Now from hence I thus argue: if the worſhip forbidden by this Law be ſuch, as can be known by the external act, then this Law can have no regard to the degrees of worſhip, for the degrees of worſhip are not in the external acts, but in the mind of the worſhipper, which cannot be known by external acts. Now that the Law did forbid the external acts of worſhip, without any regard to the intention of the worſhipper, appears in this, that this Idolatrous worſhip was to be puniſhed with death, and therefore it muſt be ſuch external Idolatry as falls under the cognizance of humane Judicatures. Had there been any regard to the degrees of worſhip, no man could have been convicted of Idolatry by the external act, and could not have been liable to puniſhment, unleſs he had confeſſed his intention of giving ſupreme worſhip to a falſe God, and ſo this Law of putting ſuch Idolaters to death had ſignified nothing, becauſe it had been impoſſible for them to convict any man of Idolatry, but by his own confeſſion; but when the external act which is viſible to all men, is ſufficient to convict any man of Idolatry, it is next to a demonſtration, that the Law

13 Deuter. 6, 7. &c.

had no reſpect to the degrees, but to the acts of worſhip.

And that our Saviour in that Law, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve, had no regard to the different degrees of worſhip, I have already proved at large, for allowing that diſtinction, he had not given a good anſwer to the Devils temptation.

Thus as for their diſtinction between abſolute and relative worſhip, that though we muſt not worſhip any Creature, the moſt excellent Saints and Angels, for themſelves, yet we may worſhip them upon account of that relation they have to God; that is, we may worſhip them for Gods ſake, though not for their own; I find no intimation of any ſuch diſtinction in the Law. We are there commanded to have no other Gods, to worſhip God and him onely, which excludes Saints and Angels from being the object of our worſhip, as well as Devils.

2. But poſſibly it may be ſaid, that though the Law takes no notice of ſuch diſtinctions, yet the Scripture in the explication of this Law may make allowances for it. Now in anſwer to this, I onely deſire to know, where the Scripture has made any ſuch diſtinction between worſhipping good and evil Spirits, the enemies and Rivals, or the Friends of God, between ſupreme and ſubordinate, abſolute or relative worſhip; I can find no ſuch diſtinctions in Scripture, & I have a material reaſon to believe no ſuch can be found, *viz.* becauſe there was no occaſion for them. The Scripture no-where allows us to give any kind of worſhip to any Creature, and therefore there was no need to diſtinguiſh between the kinds and degrees of worſhip.

The moſt material thing that can be ſaid in this cauſe is this: that when the Scripture mentions this Law of wor-

worſhipping One God, it oppoſes it to the worſhip of the falſe Gods of the Heathens; from whence ſome may conclude, that God forbade the worſhip only of theſe falſe Gods. But we muſt conſider, that the Law is conceived in ſuch general terms, as to exclude the worſhip of all Beings beſides the Supreme God; but it could not be thought, that God ſhould at that time immediately apply this Law againſt the worſhip of any other Beings, but thoſe which were at that time worſhipped in the world. If God gives a Law, which forbids the worſhip of all Beings beſides himſelf; and particularly applies this Law to prohibite the worſhip of all thoſe Gods which were then worſhipped in the world, will any one in their wits hence conclude, that if the folly and ſuperſtition of men ſhould ſet up a new race and generation of Gods in after ages, that the worſhip of theſe new Gods is not as well forbidden by this general Law, as the worſhip of thoſe gods which were worſhipt at that time when this Law was given? if this were true, poſſibly Pagan *Rome* it ſelf was not guilty of Idolatry; for moſt, if not all of their Gods might be of a later date than the giving the Law. 6 Deut. 13, 14. 13 Deut. 7.

3. Now ſince no ſuch diſtinctions as theſe appear in Scripture, it is impoſſible they ſhould juſtifie the worſhip of Saints and Angels, which is ſo expreſly forbidden by the Law, if we will acknowledge them to be diſtinct Beings from the Supreme God; for if they are not the Supreme God, we muſt not worſhip them, for we muſt worſhip none but God. No diſtinctions can juſtifie us in this caſe, but ſuch as God himſelf makes; for otherwiſe it were eaſie to diſtinguiſh away any Law of God. Humane Laws will admit of no diſtinctions, but ſuch as they make themſelves; for a diſtinction does either confine and ſtreighten, or enlarge the Law, and he who has power to diſtinguiſh upon a Law, has ſo far power to make it. If the Law ſays, that we ſhall wor-

ſhip

ſhip no other Being beſides God, and we have power, if we have but wit enough, to invent ſome new diſtinctions, between the worſhip of good and bad ſpirits, between Supreme and Subordinate, abſolute and relative worſhip, this makes a new Law of it; for it is one thing to ſay, thou ſhalt worſhip God only, and quite contrary to ſay, thou ſhalt worſhip God only and good Spirits, God with a Supreme and abſolute, good Spirits with a ſubordinate and relative worſhip. This I think is ſufficient to ſhew, that we muſt admit of no diſtinctions upon a Divine Law, but what the Scripture it ſelf owns, and therefore ſince thoſe diſtinctions, with which the Church of *Rome* juſtifies her worſhip of Saints and Angels, are no where to be found in Scripture, they have no authority againſt an expreſs Law.

3. The next courſe the Papiſts take to juſtifie their Creature-worſhip, in contradiction to that Law, which expreſly commands us to worſhip none but God, is an appeal to ſuch authorities, as they think ſufficient to decide this matter.

Now I ſhall not ſay much to this, for I believe all Mankind will acknowledge, that no Authority leſs than Divine, can repeal a Divine Law; and therefore unleſs God himſelf, or ſuch perſons as act by a Divine Authority, have repealed this Law, no other Authority can do it. That Chriſt and his Apoſtles have not repealed this Law, I have already proved, that the whole Church in after Ages had any Authority to repeal this Law, I deſire them to prove.

For the authority of the Church, as to the eſſentials of Faith and Worſhip, is not the authority of Law-givers, but of Witneſſes. The Church never pretended in former Ages to make or to repeal any Divine Laws, but to declare and teſtifie what the belief and practice of the Primitive and Apoſtolick Churches was; and it is unreaſonable

sonable to think, that they should have any such Authority; for then Christ and his Apostles preached the Gospel to little purpose, if it were in the power of the Church to make a new Gospel of it when they pleased.

But indeed could it appear, that the Apostles did teach the Christians of that Age, and the Church in those Ages, which immediately succeeded the Apostles, did practice the worship of Saints and Angels, we should have reason to suspect, that we, and not they, are mistaken in the sense of that Law, which commands us to worship none but God.

But then none can be admitted as competent witnesses of this matter, but those who did immediately succeed the Apostles, or conversed with Apostolical men and Churches. And thanks be to God, there is no appearance of Creature worship in those Ages, we dare appeal to the testimony of Fathers and Councils for above three hundred years; and those who come after, come a little too late to be witnesses of what was done in the Apostolick Churches; especially, when all the intermediate Ages knew nothing of it.

I shall not fill up this discourse with particular Citations, which learned men know where to find; since the Roman Doctors can find nothing in the Writings of the first Fathers to justifie the worship of Saints and Angels, and the Protestant Writers find a great deal in those Ages against it.

Indeed at the latter end of the fourth Century, some of the Fathers used some Rhetorical Apostrophes to the Saints and Martyrs in their Orations, which the Church of *Rome* interprets to be Prayers to them; but though other Learned men have vindicated those passages so far, as to shew the vast difference between them, and solemn and formal Invocations, which is not my business at this time, yet there are several things very well worth

See Bishops Ushers Answer to the Jesuits Challenge.

our

our obſervation towards the true ſtating of this matter. As,

1. That theſe Fathers came too late to be witneſſes of the Apoſtolical practiſe, which they could know no otherwiſe, than we might know it, if there had been any ſuch thing, *viz.* by the teſtimony and practiſe of the Church, from the Apoſtles till that time: This was no where pretended by them, that the Invocation of Saints had been the practiſe of the Catholick Church in all ages, and they could have no proof of this, unleſs they had better Records of former times, than we have at this day, and ſuch as contradicted all the Records which we now have of the Apoſtolick and Primitive Churches, and I believe few men will be ſo hardy, as to aſſert this; and methinks there ſhould be as few, who are ſo credulous as to believe it, and I am ſure, there is no man living who is able to prove it.

2. Nay, the particular ſayings of theſe Fathers, by which the Romaniſts prove the Invocation of Saints, do not prove, that it was the Judgment and practiſe of the Church of that age. They no where ſay, that it was, and it does not appear to be ſo by any other Records. Let them ſhew me any Council before, or in thoſe times, when theſe Fathers lived, that is in the fourth Century, which decreed the worſhip of Saints and Angels. Let them produce any publick offices of Religion in thoſe days, which allows this worſhip; and if no ſuch thing appears, thoſe men muſt be very well prepared to believe this, who will without any other evidence judge of the practice of the Church, only from ſome extravagant flights of Poets and Orators: and if even in thoſe days, the worſhip of Saints was not received into the publick offices of the Church, methinks we may as well live without it ſtill, and they muſt either grant, that theſe Fathers, whoſe authority they alleadge, meant no ſuch thing

thing by these Rhetorical flourishes, as they extract out of them, or else that they introduced a new and unknown worship into the Christian Church; and then let them prove, that some few Fathers of the fourth Century, without the publick authority of the Church, had authority enough of their own to change the object of worship, contrary as the Church in former Ages, believed, to an expres Divine Law, which commands us to worship none but God.

3. Nay, I further observe, that these Fathers, whose authority is urged for the invocation of Saints by the Church of *Rome*, do no where dogmatically and positively assert the lawfulness of Praying to Saints and Angels, and many Fathers of the same Age do positively deny the lawfulness of it, which is a plain argument, that it was not the judgement and practice of the Church of that Age, and a good reasonable presumption, that these Fathers never intended any such thing in what they said, how liable soever their words may be to be expounded to such a sense.

Gregory Nazianzen, indeed in his Book against *Julian* the Apostate, speaks to the Soul of *Constantius*, in this manner: *Hear O thou Soul of great Constantius (if thou hast any sense of these things)* &c. But will you call this a Prayer to *Constantius*? does this Father any where assert in plain terms that it is lawful to pray to Saints departed? a hundred such sayings as these, which are no Prayers to Saints, cannot prove the lawfulness of praying to Saints against the constant Doctrine of the Fathers of that Age. Thus in his Funeral Oration for his Sister *Gorgonia*, he bespeaks her to this purpose, that if she knew what he was now a doing, and if holy Souls did receive this favour from God to know such matters as these, that then she would kindly accept that Oration which he made in her praise, instead of other Fune-

Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 2. in Gorg.

ral Obsequies. Is this a Prayer to *Gorgonia* to intercede for him with God? by no means! He onely desires if she heard what he said of her (which he was not sure she did) that she would take it kindly. Whereas in that very Age the Fathers asserted, that we must pray onely to God, and therefore they define Prayer by its relation to God; *That Prayer is a request of some good things, made by devout Souls to God*, that *it is a conference with God, that it is a request offered with supplication to God.* Which is a very imperfect definition of Prayer, were it lawful to pray to any other Being besides God.

Basil, *Orat. in Julit. Martyr.* Greg. Naz. *Orat. 1. de Oratione.* Chrys. *in Gen. Homil. 30.*

St. *Austin* tells us, that when the names of the Martyrs were rehearsed in their publick Liturgies, it was not to invoke them, or pray to them, but onely for an honourable remembrance; nay, he expresly tells us, that the worship of dead men, must be no part of our Religion, for if they were pious men, they do not desire this kind of honour, but would have us worship God: *honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem*, they are to be honoured for our imitation, not to be adored as an act of Religion.

Aug. *De Civit Dei, l. 22. cap. 10.*

Id. de vera religione, Cap. 55

The Council of *Laodicea* condemned the Worship of Angels; and so does *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, and others of that Age. It is notoriously known, that the *Arrians* were condemned as guilty of Idolatry for worshipping Christ, whom they would not own to be the true God, though they owned him to be far exalted above all Saints and Angels, and to be as like to God, as it is possible for any Creature to be: and those who upon these Principles, condemned the worship of the most perfect and excellent Creature, could never allow the worship of Saints and Angels.

So that though the worship of Saints and Angels, did begin about this time to creep into the Church, yet it was oppos'd by these pious and learned Fathers, and condemned

demned in the first and smallest appearances of it; which shows, that this was no Catholick Doctrine and Practice in that Age, much less that it had been so from the Apostles; and I think, after this time there was no authority in the Church to alter the object of worship, nor to justifie such an Innovation as the worship of Saints and Angels, in opposition to the express Law of God.

The sum of this Argument is this: Since there is an express Law against the worship of any other Being besides the supreme God, the Lord *Jehovah*, which never was expresly repealed, whatever plausible reasons may be urged for the worship of Saints and Angels, they cannot justifie us in acting contrary to an express Law of God.

THE END.

ERRATA.

PAge 53. *Line* 23. *for* repepealed, *read* repealed, *p.* 54. *margis*, *for* domini, *r.* dominum, *p.* 59. *l.* 30. *for* last *r.* least.

A Catalogue of Books sold by *Abel Swalle*, at the *Unicorn*, at the *West*-end of St *Paul's* Church-yard, 1685.

A *Companion to the Temple*: or, a *Help to Devotion*, in the use of the *Common Prayer*. Divided in the four Parts. Part 1. Of *Morning and Evening Prayer*. Part 2. Of the *Litany*, with the Occasional *Prayers and Thanksgivings*. Part 3. Of the *Communion Office*, with the *Offices of Baptism, Catechism* and *Confirmation*. Part 4. Of the *Occasional Offices*, viz. *Matrimony, Visitation* of the *Sick*, &c. The whole being carefully corrected, and now put into one Volume. By *Tho. Comber*, D. D. Folio.

Forty Sermons, whereof twenty one are now first published; the greatest part of them Preached before the *King*, and on *Solemn Occasions*. By *Rich. Allestry*, D. D. With an account of the *Authors Life*, in Folio.

The *Works* of Mr. *Abraham Cowley*, consisting of those which were formerly *Printed*, and those designed for the *Press*, and now Published out of the Authors *Original Papers*. The eighth Edition, in Folio.

The Second Part of the *Works* of Mr. *Abraham Cowley*; being what was written in his younger years, and now Reprinted together. The fifth Edition.

The *Case* of *Resistance* of the *Supreme Powers*, Stated and Resolved, according to the *Doctrine* of the *Holy Scriptures*. By *William Sherlock*, D. D. in Octavo.

A Vindication of the Rights of *Ecclesiastical Authority*; being an Answer to the First Part of the *Protestant Reconciler*. By *William Sherlock*, D. D. and Master of the *Temple*, in Octavo.

Pet. Dan. Huetii de Interpretatione Libri 2. duo: quarum Prior est, de Optimo Genere Interpretandi: Alter de Claris Interpret. &c. in Octavo.

The Case of *Compelling Men* to the *Holy Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper* considered. And *Authority* vindicated in it, by the Rules of the *Gospel*, and from the Common and Popular Objections against it. By the Author of the *Charge of Scandal*, omitted in the late Collection.

L. Coely Lactantii Firmiani Opera quæ extant, ad fidem MSS. recognita & Commentariis illustrata, à Tho. Spark, *A. M.* Oxonii *e Theatr. Sheldoniano.*

A *Sermon* Preached before the *King* at *White-hall*, *Novemb.* 23. 1684. By *Gilb. Ironside*, D. D. Warden of *Wadham*-Colledge in *Oxon*, &c.